Hebrew Institutions
Social and Civil

Shearer

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
* SEP 20 1910 *
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Division BS620
Section .S53

HEBREW INSTITUTIONS, SOCIAL AND CIVIL.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
SEP 20 1910
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

BY

✓

J. B. SHEARER, D. D., LL. D.,

Professor of Biblical Instruction, Davidson College, N. C.;
Author of Bible Course Syllabus; Modern Mysticism;
Sermon on the Mount; Studies in the Life of
Christ; The Scriptures, Fundamental
Facts and Features; and Selected
Old Testament Studies.

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA:
PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION.

COPYRIGHT
BY
R. E. MAGILL,
SECRETARY OF PUBLICATION,
1910.

PRINTED BY
WHITTET & SHEPPERSON
RICHMOND, VA.

DEDICATION.

To the grateful memory of Rev. Robert Lewis Dabney,
D. D., LL. D., who fifty years ago taught me the
absolute perfection of Old Testament Institutions, this volume is dedicated. "He
being dead yet speaketh."

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE FAMILY, ... 9

CHAPTER II.

LAWS OF MARRIAGE AND INCEST, ... 16

CHAPTER III.

POLYGAMY—WAS IT LAWFUL? 25

CHAPTER IV.

CLEAN AND UNCLEAN, ... 32

CHAPTER V.

MORAL STATUS OF MOSAIC INSTITUTIONS, ... 41

CHAPTER VI.

OTHER SO-CALLED BLEMISHES, ... 48

CHAPTER VII.

THE GENIUS AND SPIRIT OF HEBREW INSTITUTIONS, ... 56

CHAPTER VIII.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES, ... 63

CHAPTER IX.

ELECTIVE FEATURES OF THE REPUBLIC, ... 73

CHAPTER X.

THE NATURE OF THE HEBREW REPUBLIC, ... 81

CHAPTER XI.

THE THEOCRACY, ... 88

CHAPTER XII.

THE SACRED ORACLE, ... 98

CHAPTER XIII.

THE HEBREW JUDICIARY, ... 106

CHAPTER XIV.

THE SENATE AND THE CONGREGATION, ... 116

CHAPTER XV.

THE CODES, ... 123

CHAPTER XVI.

THE CODES CONTINUED, ... 133

CHAPTER XVII.

HOW FAR ARE JEWISH INSTITUTIONS IMITABLE?............ 143

CHAPTER XVIII.

SLAVERY—ITS BIBLE STATUS,................................. 152

CHAPTER XIX.

ABOLITIONISM—ITS TENDENCIES AND AFFILIATIONS,......... 162

PREFACE.

The whole Christian world is in a state of unrest. New and strange questions are asked everywhere. The ancient foundations seem to be unstable. "If the foundations be destroyed what shall the righteous do." What is the family? Who ordained it? What is its object and purpose? What is its constitution? What are the relations of all its members? What are its relations to church and state?

And sociology in its broader aspects. Is it a science? Where are its facts found? Who has formulated its fundamental principles?

And socialism. Who can even define it so as to include the wild vagaries of many of its votaries? What standing have the Scriptures in determining its problems?

Or civic Christianity, so called. Are its claims a novelty or are they based on divine authority? What are the relations of the church and the state? Is the state the censor morum to be controlled by "civic circles"?

Or government. What is its origin? What are its fundamental principles? Where are they defined? What are the relations of ruler and people? Is there no divine model to the test of which all may be brought?

Similar questions concerning economics, social ethics, civil laws and codes and commercial customs meet us at every turn.

How stand all these questions at the bar of revelation? Are Bible institutions inchoate and semi-barbaric? Or are they relatively excellent when compared with peoples of that day? Do they mark a stage in the progress of the race to something better?

The author does not propose a categorical discussion of all these questions. He proposes to make a careful analysis of Hebrew institutions with necessary definitions. If he shall do this successfully it ought to be accepted as God's answer to all.

He has no apology to make for his intense traditionalism. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only infallible rule of faith and practice, of doctrine and duty; and all questions must be addressed to the sacred oracles. All the varied forms of human institutions must be brought to the test of their teachings.

J. B. SHEARER.

Davidson, N. C.

HEBREW INSTITUTIONS, SOCIAL AND CIVIL.

CHAPTER I.

THE FAMILY.

The family is of Divine origin and sanction. Man was created a pair—"Male and female created He them." The plural pronoun here makes it necessary to render this passage, "A male and a female created He them"—otherwise it might seem to mean that a number of males and females were created. This, however, would contradict the teaching of the second chapter of Genesis, that Adam and Eve were two persons as they came from the hand of the Creator, Gen. ii. 7, 21, 22.

Marriage was formally instituted between this pair, for Eve became the "mother of all living", and she is afterwards called his wife. iii. 20; iv. 1, 25. Adam himself proclaimed the marriage law for his posterity, but did not originate it. When the woman was created and presented to him, he said, "This is bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and cleave unto his wife; and the twain shall be one flesh". ii. 23, 24.

This is the God-given constitution for the family. Christ endorses it as the law from the beginning for the race, and argues from it to define the rights of the parties, as we shall see. Matt. xix. 4-6. Paul also assumes the constitution of the family for all ages, and argues from it the rights of the parties. Rom. vii. 2, 3. Indeed, the Scriptures assume every where that the constitution of the family is fundamental law for the race.

The family meets the necessities of man's nature and condition from the beginning, and was instituted to meet those necessities. "The Lord said it is not good for man to be alone. I will make him a help meet for him," Gen. ii. 18. There was found no help meet for him among the fowls of the air, nor the cattle, nor the beasts of the field. Gen. ii. 20. Man is a social being, though not gregarious. Social, sentimental and moral bonds are necessary to his very existence, to say nothing of his comfort and happiness. The woman was made meet for him, exactly what he needed. There was a mutuality in the adjustment, so that each is the complement of the other; and each is necessary to the other.

The most obvious purpose of the family is the propagation of the race in holiness—"a Godly seed." "God blessed them and said, Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it," Gen. i. 28. Malachi teaches that God "sought a Godly seed", Mal. ii. 15. Paul argues that the children are holy in a Godly family, and not unclean, 1 Cor. vii. 14. There were two institutions established in the beginning of the race, the Sabbath and the family. They are both fundamental. The family is the place and the Sabbath is the special time for the training of a holy seed for God.

Monogamy and not polygamy was the law from the beginning. Malachi says, "The Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: yet is she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant. And did he not make one, although he had the residue of the spirit. And wherefore one? He sought a Godly seed." He claims that God made one woman for one man and bases his plea upon it. Mal. ii. 14, 15.

Christ argues from the same fact, "Have ye not read that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female." "And the twain shall become one flesh." Matt. xix. 5, 6.

Polygamy arose in Cain's family. Lamech took two wives, Ada and Zillah, and the relation proved a murderous one. Gen. iv. 19-24. The discussion of polygamy is reserved for another place.

From the beginning marriage was a Divine bond and an indissoluble unity. "They are no more twain but one flesh." Christ in discussing the divorce law of Moses, says, "From the beginning it was not so." He says, "What God has joined together, let no man put asunder." Marriage was an indissoluble bond till divorce was made necessary by "uncleanness" in the marriage relation; by their "hardness of heart"—evidently perverseness and sin in the marriage relation, which Christ defines as fornication. Compare Deut. xxiv. 1-4; Matt. xix. 2-9.

Marriage is not a sacrament as the Papists claim and teach with a strange inconsistency, for they also teach that celibacy is a holier state than matrimony. This is part of their scheme of priestly domination. They denounce civil marriage, and put the family under ecclesiastical law. They declare all marriages null and void which are not solemnized by an ecclesiastic because it is a sacrament. At the same time they validate a baptism administered by the laity, though it is a real sacrament. The reason of these things is not hard to see.

Marriage is not a matter of ecclesiastical origin, nor dependent on ecclesiastical law. The church originated in and from the family and not the family in and from the church. The church is composed of families of believers and their seed. The rights and franchises of each are of divine origin. A priesthood originated in the family, for in the patriarchal system, the father was the priest of the family and the responsible religious teacher. How shall the stream control and regulate the fountain? The church may and must conserve the family according to its Scriptural warrant and constitution, but only by proper teaching and discipline. The teaching is only declarative and the discipline only personal as in all other matters of right and morals.

Marriage is not a mere civil institution as has been asserted. This doctrine was a reaction against the tyranny of the Papacy which so long claimed to place marital relations and family rights under the sole jurisdiction of ecclesiastical law. It gained plausibility from the fact that certain property rights belong to members of the family, such as inheritances, support, care of the sick and aged, enforcement of contracts expressed or implied, protection against brutality on one hand and insubordination on the other, and such like. It is the function of the state to protect and defend against wrong, injustice, and oppression in all the relations of life, both in the family and out of it.

The state does not create the rights of men, but protects them. It does not create the family, but conserves it. It does not create its obligations, but recognizes them and enforces them against violation. The Divine law stands behind all civil administration so far as it deals with moral questions. So with the family. Civil law can only foster, conserve, defend or annul it, in accordance with the divine law. In deciding who may or may not marry the Scriptures are supreme authority. So also with mutual obligations in the family. Certain property rights inhere and these must be protected by the civil arm, only because the sword is a terror to evil-doers. The church and the state ought both to stand sponsor and witness the contract of marriage and uphold it, each with its appropriate arm. Marriage did not originate with the state any more than it did with the church.

The state originated in the family. The patriarch was the civil ruler as well as the religious head of the family. It would be interesting to trace the state as the out-growth from the simple headship of the family. The church and the state are both concerned to foster the family and neither should rule the other out so long as the constitution of the family is saved.

Divorce is the greatest enemy of the family—divorce for any and every cause, as was common among Greeks and Romans, and adopted by the Jews from Paganism, and justified by the Pharisees in Christ's day. Divorce is the burning question in Christian lands to-day. Shall the marriage bond be cancelled at all, and if so, by whom and for what?

We can here only emphasize the one and only cause named by Christ and by Moses. Matt. v. 31, 32; xix. 3-9; Deut. xxiv. 1-4. We hold that the state only can issue a competent annulling of the marriage contract, and for this sole cause. Annulling for any other cause does not cancel the bond in the eyes of heaven, and the church must uphold the Bible view, both by doctrine and discipline.

The man is the head of the family by right. The manner of the woman's creation would seem to teach this. She was given for an help meet for him", and she was built upon a rib taken from his side. Gen. ii. 18, 21, 22. Paul says, "The head of every man is Christ and the head of the woman is the man." "For the man is not of the woman, but the woman is of the man." "Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." I Cor. xi. 3, 8, 9. This is evidently the doctrine of the Scriptures, and the practice of Scripture times. Eph. v. 22, 23; Col. iii. 18; I Pet. iii. I. The wife's vow is to "love, cherish and obey." We need hardly cite passages to prove that this headship extends to children and servants also.

The man may not surrender this authority. He is held responsible for the conduct of his family. The Fourth Commandment emphasises this responsibility in the matter of the Sabbath. Eli failed on this point and the failure brought untold disasters to his family and his people. His is the lesson for all families, and for all times. "His sons made themselves vile and he restrained them not." I Sam. iii. 11-14.

When Abraham stood before the Lord looking toward Sodom, the Lord said, "Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do? etc. For I know that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment." Then the Lord conferred fully with him about the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. Here we note this remarkable thing; Abraham's righteous rule over his household was not only pleasing to the Lord, but he assigned it as a reason for making him a confidential friend and advisor. Gen. xviii. 19.

We have seen that the family is the primordial unit in church and state and that both are profoundly interested in its integrity. Family corruption and disintegration undermine them both. The two enemies which now threaten the integrity of the family are twin sisters—easy divorce and woman's rights.

Easy divorce ignores the fact that both husband and wife "are no more twain but one flesh"; it undermines the home; it discounts the strongest human affections in the interest of a sordid selfishness. The child is robbed of its birthright, the supreme united love of father and mother, and falls into the abyss of their mutual hatred and selfishness. It degrades the family to a mere partnership between equals which may be dissolved at the interest or caprice of either party without social stigma or disgrace.

Woman's rights asserts this same equality of partnership, and denies the headship of the man over the woman. It claims to emancipate woman from a thraldom which they say is heritage from Paganism. It opens up all occupations and ambitions of life to woman equally with man. It makes woman the rival and competitor of man instead of "a help meet for him." In so far as it makes woman the bread winner it consigns her again to the barbaric thraldom of which they profess to find the remedy.

We say therefore that "woman's rights" opposes the Divine plan, subverts all law and authority, defeats its own aims, degrades woman and promotes infidelity. More of this anon.

CHAPTER II.

LAWS OF MARRIAGE AND INCEST.*

The question who may and who may not marry is an important one. We may expect it to be answered in the Scriptures as a part of the God-given constitution of the family. We find the answer in the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus. The forbidden degrees are carefully enumerated in concrete form, rather than by an abstract statement of the relationships which are forbidden. This is the more common Scripture method. We need therefore to make a careful induction of all the prohibitions given in order to define lawful degrees of marriage.

There is apparently a repetition of the same laws in the twentieth chapter of Leviticus. A careful examination of the context in that chapter indicates that Moses there refers to incestuous immoralities, and not to marriage at all. By comparing the two chapters, however, we see that the forbidden degrees of marriage are the same as the incestuous degrees, so that marriage within the forbidden degrees is incest. It is common therefore to refer to the eighteenth chapter as giving the degrees of marriage and incest. There may be no objection to this, except that it is safest to limit every part of the Scripture to its own proper scope and application.

If the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus does not regulate the degrees of marriage, there are no laws on that subject in the Scriptures. It has always been so understood by the Jewish people and has been so interpreted and accepted by Christian churches and peoples.

---

*See note at end of Chapter.

These laws are social laws, and are no part of the Jewish ceremonial and typical system, and therefore did not become null and pass away with things essentially Jewish in their origin and form.

They certainly antedated Mosaic institutions, how long we do not know. They were in force against the heathen nations who were to be driven out of Canaan. They were to be driven out when the cup of their iniquity should be full. Gen. xv. 16. We learn from Lev. xviii. 3, 24-28, that the violations of these laws were prominent in their wicked abominations, and they were "vomited out" of the land for that reason. Moses also warns his people that they would suffer the same fate if they defiled the land in the same way, "That thy land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations that were before you," Lev. xviii. 28.

The same laws of marriage and incest seem to have been in force among all nations, both civilized and uncivilized. Paul rebukes the Corinthian Church for tolerating a form of incest—"such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife." 1 Cor. v. 1. The Greeks and Romans and Barbarians alike, have in the main recognized these laws as an unwritten code. So also the Asiatic peoples of ancient and modern times. History records disgraceful violations in certain kingdoms of Central Asia. But even there the violations were confined to the royal families, and originated in supposed political necessities, and, besides, were condoned by a servile priesthood on the principle that the king could do no evil. There is no need to argue further the universality of these laws. Church and state must uphold them without modification.

We do not know when these limitations on marriage were first promulgated nor how widely. The marriage of brothers and sisters and other near relations was a necessity in the family of Adam and Eve, and in the generations immediately subsequent. After the flood Sarah seems to have been the half sister of Abraham, for he said to Abimelech, "And yet indeed she is my sister: the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother; and she became my wife." Gen. xx. 12.

These limitations were surely made necessary by man's sinfulness. They are founded on the necessities of society. Men and women closely related by affinity and consanguinity must needs dwell together in the same home and family. A "covering for the eyes" is needed for mutual protection against jealousies on the one hand and sins on the other. These limitations furnish that covering to the eyes. They are so deep rooted that they seem to have the force of nature, and a violation is denounced as contrary to nature. The moral and politic reasons for these laws are universal.

Besides, these limitations are guarded by providential visitations on incestuous offspring. We need not suppose that there has been any modification of natural law for this purpose since the curse was pronounced at the Fall, but that these visitations are by and through the natural laws of propagation. The stock breeder says that he finds it necessary to introduce new blood from time to time if he would avoid degeneration in his herds, or if he desires to improve them. Men of science trace the law of degeneration or betterment, and tell us that similar traits, whether good or bad, are accentuated and exaggerated in the offspring, and that the process is more rapid if continued for a few generations.

We are here not so much concerned with the process as we are with the conceded fact that such providential visitations come upon the offspring of parents too closely related in blood. This law of heredity is so obvious that some are bitterly opposed to one or more degrees that are not forbidden in the Scriptures. It does not seem competent for man to add to or take from the divinely appointed degrees.

Nearness of relationship is the principle that determines all the prohibited degrees. "None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, etc." The literal Hebrew says, "remainder of his flesh." All the authorities agree that it is properly rendered, "near of kin to him." Now the word "kin" expresses relationship both of consanguinity and affinity, by blood or by marriage. This is the first meaning given in Webster, and the second meaning is relatives, and we find the same two meanings given under the word "kindred." So we find that the forbidden degrees are relationships both by blood and by marriage. This disposes of the claim made by some that kin is always blood kin, and that persons connected by marriage are relatives only and are not kin. We need only remember further that man and woman in marriage become "one flesh." Gen. ii. 24.

From a careful examination of the several prohibited degrees as enumerated in Leviticus xviii. 7-17, we deduce regulative rules by necessary generalization.

Rule 1. Degrees of kindred nearer than first cousin are forbidden. We may see at a glance, without citation, that the first cousin is one remove further away than any of the prohibited degrees. This, in turn, allows first cousins to marry, because the prohibitions are based on nearness. It may be conceded, however, that the inter-marriage of cousins from generation to generation does sometimes produce mischievous heredities, especially if there be any serious taint in the family. Some go so far as to forbid the marriage of any person who has a serious bodily or mental taint, lest it be transmitted to posterity by heredity. Such attempts to interpret providence and thereby improve on God's legislation would in the end overthrow the Scripture family altogether.

There is a materialistic science and philosophy which denies the possibility of regenerating the race on the old Bible methods, through the family and the church. They argue that none but the better specimens of the race should be allowed to propagate themselves. They would stamp out all physical and moral degeneracy in this way.

Rule 2. Prohibition of that which is more remote thereby prohibits all that is nearer, because it is a question of nearness. The more remote prohibitions set the boundaries for all within. This rule is so obvious that it needs no proof.

Rule 3. Special prohibitions given in one sex bind both sexes, for it is still a question of nearness. Besides, this rule applies to all precepts and laws, except where the distinction of sex is of the essence of the precept, and is the ground and reason thereof; and this must plainly appear. If it be said, "A man shall not steal," it means also that a woman may not steal. There is no need to repeat such precepts for each sex.

Rule 4. Relationships by marriage are recognized as legal and real and stand on the same footing as relationships by blood. Both are equally prohibited if one is prohibited. This agrees with the definition of "kin" which has been given. Verse 14 forbids a man to marry his father's brother's wife, "because she is thine aunt"? She is put on the same footing as his father's sister. One is aunt by blood, the other by marriage. They are both forbidden because they are both aunts. So says the law. Similarly a man may not take his father's wife, his son's wife, nor his brother's wife, for the reason that the wife occupies the same status of nearness that the husband occupies, and it is so stated as the reason for the prohibitions, verses 8, 15, 16, 6.

This is what we might expect from the oneness of the marriage relation, "The twain are one flesh." This unit, this one flesh, stands in the same relation to the blood kin of either and each, husband and wife. Divine law makes and declares it so, and human law ought so to recognize it.

Rule 5. It is wickedness to marry the wife's near kinswoman even to the fourth degree of blood. Verse 17 forbids a man to take his wife's daughter, or her son's daughter or her daughter's daughter, "For they are her near kinswomen; it is wickedness." The marriage of the wife's near kinswoman is here denounced as wickedness in unmistakable terms. The daughter is only half the mother's blood, as every stock raiser understands, and the granddaughter is only one-fourth. This is therefore forbidden? It is a curious fact that the fourth degree is not allowed in regular line of descent but is allowed as the outside limit in collateral line of decent, for first cousins are separated by the fourth degree. The reason for this difference is not given.

It may be pertinent to ask here why the Jews have allowed a man to marry his niece, while he may not marry his aunt. They have adopted a system of literalism in their interpretation in which they follow the letter of the law and refuse to see the underlying principle of the law. In this case they allow that which is not definitely mentioned. By this false principle of interpretation they made void the law in Christ's day.

It is also pertinent to inquire the significance of the

Levirate marriages. The law forbids a man to marry his brother's wife. Yet it is provided elsewhere that a widow without children might claim her dead husband's nearest of kin, notably his brother, to take her to wife. He was not compelled to do so though the obligation seems to have been generally recognized. This was the Levirate marriage, from the word levir which means "brother-in-law." This was the usage among the patriarchs, Gen. xxxviii. 6-8. The full provisions of this law are found in Deut. xxv. 5-10. The case of Ruth is familiar and in point. It seems to have been practiced later. Cf. Luke xx. 27-33.

This was an exception made to the law for a purpose. The first born of a Levirate marriage was counted in law as the son of the dead father and stood in their genealogies as his son and successor. This was part of the patriarchal system and was necessary for birthrights, inheritances, and perhaps other things. This exception to the law was made for a purpose and the exception established the law more firmly where the reason for the exception did not exist, according to a familiar legal maxim, "the exception establishes the rule."

The sacred books of India provide for Levirate marriage to this day, but expound it to mean something entirely different from the provision in the Jewish law. They teach that a man's happiness in the next world is marred if he has no child to represent him in this world, therefore the younger brother or some near kinsman must take his childless widow and raise up seed for him.

This exception shows that these laws of marriage are positive precepts, and are not based on intrinsic moral distinctions. But like all other positive enactments, they have all the force of moral law when once properly enacted, and must be recognized and enforced by all proper jurisdiction.

May a man marry his wife's sister? The traditional view of the law is that he may not. This was the consensus of all Christendom, both in ecclesiastical and civil legislation until recent times. This matter came to the front in the nineteenth century and gradually the doctrine has won its way, that a man may marry his wife's sister. Many churches have so altered their standards as to allow it, or, at least, to leave it to the individual conscience to determine in each case. It is still forbidden through out the British Empire, and in other quarters, or if altered it was done very recently.

The plea is that the Scriptures do not forbid it. They argue that the wife's sister is not blood kin to her sister's husband, and that it is most proper that the sister should adopt and rear her dead sister's children. If this last reason be recognized as good, it puts the man under obligation to take his wife's sister; and if he fails to do so, he not only puts a slight upon the family, but does his children a great wrong. This view of the case is said to prevail in some quarters and must become more general from the very nature of the case.

If the general exposition of the law in Leviticus is sound it is very easy to settle the question by an application of the five rules above set forth, for such marriage overrides them all.

Apply Rule 5. It is wickedness to take the wife's near kinswoman to the fourth degree of blood. The wife's sister is the nearest possible for she is the whole blood, having the same mother and father.

Apply Rule 4. Relationships by marriage are counted the same as relationships by blood. The nearness of kin includes both these as we have seen.

Apply Rule 3. Special prohibitions in one sex include both sexes. A man shall not take his brother's wife means also that a woman shall not take her sister's husband.

Rules 1 and 2 need not be commented on in their application to this case.

We conclude therefore that the traditional view stands against all comers. If the contention of the opposite view prevail, the entire law must fall sooner or later. The son may then marry the father's widow, for she is not blood kin, and then the father may take the son's wife because they are not blood kin, and so on. The only escape from this logic would be to adopt the literalism of the Pharisees and stick to the letter while ignoring the spirit or principle which underlies the letter of the law.

When driven from every other position they entrench themselves behind the eighteenth verse and claim that it gives a special permit to marry the wife's sister after the wife's death. The traditional view of this verse is that it is a prohibition of polygamy and has no reference to degrees of marriage. This will be shown in the discussion of polygamy.

NOTE.—The views above expressed concerning the marriage of the wife's sister are not in accord with the Confession of Faith of our church as recently amended. It reads as follows: "Marriage ought not to be within the degrees of consanguinity or affinity forbidden by the word," etc., Chap. XXIV., Sec. 4. The amendment originated in the author's presbytery and was supported by him, because the old law had been long a dead letter. The entire matter seems left to the Christian conscience to do or to teach. Under this liberty the author puts forward the above argument as his own view of what is "forbidden in the word."

It is proper, therefore, to say definitely that these views are personal and do in no sense commit the church or the Publication Committee who publish the book for me, to their endorsement. J. B. SHEARER, Author.

CHAPTER III.

POLYGAMY.

Monogamy was evidently the law from the beginning as was shown in the discussion of the family and its God-given constitution. Polygamy started before the flood, but there was none in the family of Noah and the second start for the race manifested the same law of marriage—one man and one woman in the family—as it was in Eden.

Still polygamy was found in many nations of antiquity and is still found in some in modern times. It has never prevailed widely among any people, but has been limited largely to the ruling classes. If it had been practiced widely, a correspondingly large number of men would have had no wives at all, because the number of males and females born into the world have been nearly equal.

We see that it was practiced in partriarchal times. Esau and Jacob practiced it. Concubines were wives of inferior degree, but they and their children were recognized as members of the family and had rights in the family. It was practiced later among the Jewish people and was not entirely limited to the kings. The fact of its presence in the Hebrew commonwealth has given rise to a diversity of sentiment about it.

Some have argued that polygamy is innocent and right because it was practiced there, apparently unrebuked. Others say that it was tolerated as an unavoidable blemish on the Hebrew commonwealth. Others still cite it as a part of a crude and semi-barbaric system along with Goelism and slavery and a defective morality, all of which was finally corrected or eliminated by the superior light of later times. It is important to ascertain the real status of polygamy in the Scriptures and in the divine legislation.

This much is certain? If the Old Testament law justified or even tolerated polygamy, it was, so far, a divine modification of the constitution of the family. It is still lawful to him that will, for there has been no legislation on the subject since Old Testament times. If so, where? If this be true, it inheres in every man as a natural right to take as many wives as he pleases, and all interference by church or state is an impertinance and an inexcusable tyranny. This is the doctrine of Mormons and Moslems. Are they right? We answer, No! because it is easy to show that it was forbidden in Hebrew legislation.

In the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus we have the degrees of marriage enumerated and defined in verses 6-17. In the eighteenth verse we have these words, "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other in her lifetime." What is the real import of this addition to the marriage laws?

Those who plead for the right to marry the wife's sister say that this is a special exception to the marriage laws and a special permit to marry the wife's sister, provided it is not done in the lifetime of the wife; or in other words, that a man may not have two sisters at once as Jacob did; and that the reason is that they will vex each other or quarrel; and a warning against it was Jacob's experience. One objection to this exegesis is that it proves too much. It implies that a man may marry any other two women, or more, at once. In fact the polygamist stakes his whole position on this implication. It also implies that any other women who are not sisters will not vex one another and quarrel—a most remarkable assumption. The experience of polygamists would throw some light on that subject. There is no need to enter a polygamous home to ascertain the jealous animosities, strifes and scandals between rival wives and their several sets of children. Sarah and Hagar illustrate the trend though Sarah was mistress, and she had given her handmaid to her husband for a temporary purpose. This passage doubtless means something else.

The traditional interpretation makes it a prohibition of polygamy. This exegesis was generally accepted by theologians and commentators until it was wrested to do duty in a new field as seen above.

The word sister in the Hebrew and English is used to signify several things besides a blood sister. For this reason the blood sister in the marriage laws is made definite by qualifying words, "Thy sister, the daughter of thy father or the daughter of thy mother, whether born at home or abroad;" "Thy father's sister, she is thy father's near kinswoman," etc.

The word sister also is used to mean one of a pair, a mate. Two things adjusted to each other are sisters. Webster gives as one definition of sister, "one of the same kind, or condition; sister fruits." The Revised Version reads, "Thou shalt not take a woman to her sister, to be her rival, beside the other in her lifetime." The margin reads, "one wife to another." This is prescriptive usage as we see by comparing Ex. xxvi. 3, "Five curtains shall be coupled together, one to another, etc." The Hebrew is "one to its sister," just as above. Even the wife is called a sister in Cant. iv. 10; v. 1. English usage illustrates this abundantly—sister wheels in machinery—

sister lasts in a shoeshop, etc. Thus we see that verse 18 is a prohibition of polygamy—a fitting conclusion to the laws of marriage. It perpetuates by positive statute the usage of the ages against incipient polygamy.

Do other Scriptures reinforce this statute, or do they surrender it to the example set by David, Solomon and others?

Polygamy was expressly forbidden to the kings, lest they imitate Gentile usages. In Deut. xvii. 17, we find that a king was provided for in advance by Moses, and certain rules are laid down for his guidance; one of which is, "Neither shall he multiply wives unto himself." Others were under slight temptation to do so. Malachi, a prophet under the Mosaic dispensation and a vigorous upholder of it, argues definitely against it, enforcing the law of Monogamy, ii. 14, 15. We may paraphrase it. "Was not one woman made for one man in order to rear a holy seed? Why then deal treacherously with the wife of thy youth? Why seek ye unlawful divorce? Why take other wives?"

Polygamy is smirched in its origin. It arose in Cain's time, a Godless family. Lamech took two wives, and his jealousy or their infidelity, or both, culminated in murder.

Its development into Eastern harems abounds in treachery and mutilations and remorseless murders. It is needless to say that Mormanism has been a murderous system—witness the Mountain Meadow massacre.

It is strange that the cases mentioned in the Old Testament should be quoted as proof of Divine approval, or even toleration. "The tree is known by its fruits."

Under the most favorable conditions it destroys family peace and the sweetness of home. Jacob drained a cup of sorrow to its very dregs. Hannah was a woman of a sorrowful heart because of her adversary Peninnah. Jephthah, the son of Gilead, was cast out because he was the son of a concubine.

It was far worse in the cases of David's and Solomon's wholesale violations of the law of monogamy. The veil was lifted from the family sorrows of David, and all its bitterness and woe, so that men may not follow his example. Solomon's seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines doubtless bore bitter fruits in the family and drove the iron into his own soul, but we are told nothing about it, because it was overshadowed by the fruitage in his kingdom. Luxury, corruption, oppression, idolatry and apostasy ran riot, and the decay of his kingdom was rapid—his wives sowed the seed of a harvest worse than that which sprang from the fabled dragon's teeth.

The family nomenclature of the race refuses any standing room for polygamy. We read of a man and his wife. Man and wife are correlative terms. Even in the harem, one is chief, and is the wife superior to all the rest. She only is the queen and her children are legitimate in the proper sense of the word. When Vashti was divorced by Artaxerxes he had numerous wives, but he sought his kingdom over for a successor to the divorced queen, and in due season Queen Esther was installed in her place.

It might be interesting to show how polygamy tends to degeneracy. The plural wife in the royal harem is a petted plaything of a day and is doomed to a useless life, or she becomes a drudge and a slave with no outlook of cheer or hope.

Was there another form of polygamy called polyandry in which the woman had several husbands? Certain social scientists, prying into antiquity, tell us that they find evidence in certain ancient and barbarous peoples that the woman was the social unit and the head of the home with two or more husbands according to her own pleasure. These scientists tell us that they consider this the origin of the family in its earliest beginnings. There is no trace of polyandry in the Scriptures, although they give the history of the race for four thousand years, and do seem to uncover every possible form of anomaly and abomination of which the race is capable.

If there was such a system among any savage people it can be accounted for in this way. Absolute idleness is the vice of the men of degenerate peoples. The chase and war are their only occupations. Their women are their breadwinners; they tan and curry the leather, spin and weave their clothes, make their clothes and their tents, care for the cattle, and manage their children; and their idle husbands stand in awe of their vigorous tongues and still more vigorous claws. The husband becomes a mere appenage in the family, idle and useless. The women are developed into a real superiority over the men, and their wits are sharpened by necessity and industry. It might certainly become possible for a few strong-minded and enterprising women to attach a few idle and degenerate men to their train to do their bidding and share their bounty. It is extremely improbable that the system should become general any more than ordinary polygamy, and for the same reasons.

Polygamy would seem to be better than promiscuous harlotry and easy divorce. The polygamist feels bound to care for every wife and concubine he takes and her offspring. The whoremonger casts off his partner and denies his offsprings. Easy divorce casts off wife and children except as natural affection asserts itself. The Morman makes a powerful plea along this line in behalf of his system and against his enemies, but it is easy to see that the plea is a deceitful one. No man can convert his own deep depravity into virtue by pointing out a deeper depravity elsewhere. Such an argument may shut the mouth of an opponent, but it establishes no truth.

The trend of this discussion is to clear the law of Moses of at least one blemish which its enemies have sought to put upon it. It is our privilege to consider others, for we believe that the "Law is holy, and the commandment holy, just and good." Rom. vii. 12.

CHAPTER IV.

SOCIAL DISTINCTIONS—CLEAN AND UNCLEAN.

The distinction of clean and unclean animals was made from the beginning for sacrificial and religious purposes. We read that Abel offered the firstlings of his flock and the fat thereof. Gen. iv. 4. The Hebrew indicates sheep or goats. While no mention is made here of the distinction the Israelites understood that sacrificial victims were limited to clean animals and that both sheep and goats belong to that class. Genesis was written for them and we interpret the facts as they certainly must have done.

Besides, the distinction was recognized when unclean animals went into the ark by twos and clean animals by sevens, all divinely called and directed as by an unerring instinct. Gen. vii. 2-9.

When Noah went out of the ark with his family and every beast, fowl, cattle and creeping thing, he built an altar unto the Lord. And he took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl and offered a burnt offering unto the Lord. Gen. viii. 15-20. When we take these three references together we cannot for a moment doubt that this distinction of clean and unclean animals dated back to the beginning.

God made a covenant with Noah that day which we may consider the bill of rights for the race. Of the many features of this covenant it is pertinent to mention only one. The permission was given to eat flesh just as the green herb had been given in the creation covenant. Every beast of the field and fowl of the air and fish of the sea was given for meat according to taste with one sole limitation, that the eating of blood was forbidden. No other dietetic limitation was imposed or ever has been imposed upon the race, Gen. i. 29; ix. 2-4. The apparent limitation found in Acts xv. 20, 29, "Pollutions of idols, meats offered to idols," is not a dietetic rule, but a prohibition of idolatrous feasts and worship.

This distinction of clean and unclean for sacrificial purposes was continued till "Messiah the Prince" was "cut off" and "made sacrifice and oblation to cease," Dan. ix. 24-27. Clean animals for sacrifice were limited to sheep, goats, neat cattle, doves pigeons and sparrows, We need hardly cite the proofs of this.

Hebrew institutions proper were set up at Mt. Sinai. They were divinely appointed through Moses. They included civil, social, moral and religious features, the major part of which had been handed down the ages with the divine imprimatur upon them. Some were permanent and universal, and some, limited and temporary.

Certain modifications of older institutions and certain additions were made to suit changed conditions, in all of which, however, fundamental principles were expressed and preserved in varied concrete forms.

Moses extended the distinction to diet, and carefully defined clean and unclean meats, and made the classification of clean meats much larger than that which had previously prevailed for sacrificial purposes. Bloody offerings were limited to the same animals and fowls as heretofore. We may state the classification for diet thus:

1. Beasts that both parted the hoof and chewed the cud were clean: all others unclean.

2. All birds and fowls were clean except carrion birds and birds of prey.

3. Fishes that have both scales and fins were clean; all others were unclean.

4. All creeping things, either animals or insects, creeping, or flying, or both, were unclean, except four varieties of locusts or grasshoppers, which were clean and are still much used for food in the East. These distinctions of clean and unclean meats are carefully recorded in Levit. xi. 1-47, and in Deut. xiv. 1-20.

5. There was still another class of unclean animals which they were forbidden to eat, to-wit: things that died of themselves, or were torn of wild beasts, or were strangled, or still had the blood in the flesh.

6. The eating of blood was also forbidden in any form, and this is the reason of the prohibitions in the fifth class.

These two prohibitions, 5 and 6, were not peculiar to Mosaic institutions, but are found in the covenant with Noah. The reason there given is, "The blood is the life." So long as this is true the prohibition remains. This prohibition is reiterated in the decree of the council at Jerusalem, "Things strangled and blood," lest some might imagine it was a part of the Jewish law of clean and unclean meats, which was to pass away so soon. Peter's vision of the sheet let down from heaven pointed through the abrogation of clean and unclean meats to the unification of Jew and Gentile in Christ Jesus, and he so understood it, Acts x. 11-28.

We may now consider the reason and significance of these dietetic rules and their utility in the Jewish economy.

Were they mere sanitary laws designed to promote the health of God's chosen people? This has been put forward as a scientific theory and argued with great plausibility. We are told that swine's flesh in any form is exceedingly unwholsesome; that the habits of the animal are filthy in the extreme; and that eating the flesh of the hog is the source of all scrofulous diseases. They tell us that the Greek name for the hog furnished the name for the disease that we call scrofula, and that the ancient Greeks so understood it. They tell us also that crustaceans and many other marine animals are both filthy and unsanitary.

In reply we may ask, why were not these dietetic rules enjoyned on Noah and all his posterity as well on the Jews, and why were they allowed to lapse after the Jewish economy passed away? Did God care nothing for the sanitary consequences to the race when he gave to Noah and his posterity a covenant right to eat the hog and the oyster even till now?

If these laws were based on sanitary reasons, and if their purpose was the health of the people, we might expect to find evidence of the fact in the Scriptures. We find nothing of the sort—not the remotest hint. It is rather a fascinating thing to excogitate reasons for divine legislation and to sustain them by scientific conclusions, especially when the law giver has assigned no reasons for his decrees. But when the law-giver expounds his reasons and purposes it would be mere presumption to assign other reasons for his legislation.

Some have confounded clean and unclean meats with ceremonial cleanness and uncleanness, but they seem to have but little in common. Ceremonial cleanness and uncleanness were purely typical of fitness or unfitness to take part in religious festivals, or typical service, or worship. Ordinary ceremonial uncleanness implied no necessary moral delinquency. Those who buried the dead body of man or beast were unclean. The leper was unclean and the sufferer from many other diseases. The virtuous mother was unclean for thirty-three or sixty days according to the sex of her child. Many of the callings of life made men habitually unclean except when they were sprinkled with the ashes of the heifer. The cleansing was a purification from ceremonial uncleanness and gave a fitness to approach the Passover or other ordinances. It no doubt typified a cleansing from sin as did all their baptisms. Cf. Heb. ix. 10-14.

There seems to be something different about clean and unclean meats. They had nothing in common with ceremonial defilements. The clean and the unclean ate clean meats regularly and their ceremonial status was in nowise affected thereby.

We find the key to the whole matter in Levit. xx. 22-26. By a careful study of this passage we learn several things which may be confirmed and illustrated from the Scriptures and other sources.

1. It was God's plan and purpose to establish a separate people. Much has been said about Jewish exclusiveness, and that in an uncomplimentary way. It is true that at a late period in Jewish institutions many antagonisms were fostered both on the outside and on the inside. God was not the author of these, but he did establish Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to be a separate people. The line of circumcision and uncircumcision was sharply drawn from the beginning. It saved them from amalgamation in Egypt for two hundred years. We find God the author of their separateness, not exclusiveness.

2. Israel was in constant and dangerous contact with Pagan peoples in Canaan, in Egypt and in the wilderness. Later on Edom and Moab and Phoenecia and Syria and the remnants of the Canaanite nations at their very doors were a constant menace to their integrity and permanence.

3. They needed every protection possible. The circumcision covenant was a large protection on the religious

side, but needed to be reinforced when faith and religion waned. Mere racial antagonisms were not sufficient, for Edom and Moab and Ishmael and Midian were near of kin to them and therefore the more dangerous.

4. All other nations and peoples had become or were becoming polytheistic and idolatrous, and their religious rites and orgies became licentious, cruel and bloody. They rejoiced in the immoralities enumerated in the twentieth chapter of Leviticus. Israel could be protected from the foul contagion only by separateness. How shall it be accomplished?

5. There must be a great social barrier. Levit. xx. 25, 26, "Ye shall therefore put difference between unclean and clean fowls: and ye shall not make your souls abominable by beast or fowl, or by any manner of living thing, that creepeth on the ground, which I have separated from you as unclean. And ye shall be holy unto me, for I the Lord am holy, and have severed you from other people, that you shall be mine."

Clean and unclean meats built up a great social barrier. Circumcision was the great religious barrier on the one side, and the table furnished the great barrier on the other side. Religious and social forces are the most powerful known among men. The Lord provided both for the protection of his people.

Circumcision became the synonym for patriotism also, because their faith was the inspiration of their patriotism. Note David's question, "Who is the uncircumcised Philistine, that should defy the armies of the living God," 1 Sam. xvii. 26. His patriotic scorn is intensified by his religious faith.

We are concerned here however with the social forces which made Israel a separate people. The family is the unit in every community and the social rules or laws of the family regulate the attitude of the community on all social questions. There is a proper sense in which a man's "home is his castle," into which none may intrude except by consent.

The table is the center of family life. The members of the family gather around the table three times a day to partake of the common meal. Though they may be scattered at all other hours in varied avocations the circle is restored three times a day, more than a thousand times a year, after counting out necessary temporary family separations. Family interests and even family secrets are discussed around the table. Family sympathy and family ties are strengthened. Family antipathies are intensified and the uncongenial are ruled out of the charmed circle. Friendships are cultivated and strengthened around the family board. Guests are honored in the household by breaking bread together. The poor and needy are often invited inside the circle if they be not so contaminated with vice as to make the contact dangerous to the household. The Pharisees abused a sound principle when they established unnecessary social castes and refused to eat with publicans and sinners. Paul, however, draws the proper line in 1 Cor. v. 11, and adds, "With such an one no not to eat."

The family is the place for fostering religious life. Piety starts in the home in filial affection and then reaches out after God. The family is the religious unit and its object is a holy seed as we have seen. Family religion in some form has prevailed in all ages. Worship at the table, before and after and during the meal, has prevailed in all religions. Among pagans and idolaters the symbols of their worship abounded on their tables. Their drinking cups, their platters, their tables and their couches were devoted to their Gods and ornamated with symbols of their religion, often times unspeakably immoral and foul. Meats offered to idols were their choisest food and were consecrated by their devotions.

How then shall Israel be kept separate from the idolatrous peoples and practices around them? God's plan was to establish social barriers. We can think of nothing that would answer the purpose better. He therefore forbade his people to eat or even touch those articles of food which formed the principle diet of those peoples, some of which was always found on their tables. Swine's flesh and fat, every edible form of game, wild beats of every variety, and numerous varieties of shell fish and other ocean products were the staple of their living. These were all classed as unclean, and also as "abominable" and "abominations," the strongest possible terms that could be used.

This distinction was so deeply rooted in the minds of pious Jews that they often suffered martyrdom rather than eat swine's flesh or drink the broth of it. This was made the test in the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes and others. We may form some conception of the purpose and power of this great social barrier to keep them a separate people, when we consider their separateness for 1800 years down to the present time. Unclean meats are still abominable to the Jew. He must surrender the binding authority of these dietetic laws before he can be absorbed by other peoples among whom he lives.

When God assigns the reason for the distinction of clean and unclean meats, and when we have an inspired record of its operation under Divine administration, for 1500 years, and when we also see its providential working for eighteen centuries more, we need hardly invent other reasons for the divine legislation.

One more question; was this separateness illiberal and exclusive as some do charge? It might as well be asked if the separateness of quarantine of leprosy or smallpox is illiberal and exclusive. Modern liberalism not only tolerates but patronizes many forms of heresy and falsehood and often denounces the dogmatist who would save the truth against all comers and calls him a narrow-minded bigot.

But the separateness of Israel was not exclusive and illiberal unless the author of it was so. Divine institutions are the expression of the divine holiness. If the critic would start with this proposition he would find his vocation gone.

This separation was designed to close the door of paganism against the Jew, but it left the door of Judaism open to the pagan idolater. In Jewish institutions, social, civil and religious, there was "one law for the home born and the stranger." The foreigner who adjured his idolatry and embraced the faith of the Jews was received with open arms. The Jewish church was as liberal and generous and wide open to the proseyte as the Christian church of any age. They both have always had the same divine commission. This is more fully discussed and illustrated in another place.

CHAPTER V.

THE MORAL STATUS OF MOSAIC INSTITUTIONS.

All civil and social institutions have a moral aspect. They express in a concrete form the character, the aspirations, the ideals and the civilization of the people. We therefore must consider the moral aspects of Hebrew institutions. They have been sadly criticised in many quarters and the argument has too often been surrendered to the hostile critics who profess to find a great variety of blemishes. If this be once admitted it becomes a breach in the defenses of the truth through which other criticisms easily enter until the real friends of the truth feel obliged to adopt modified views of inspiration in order to save the remainder of the truth. This is a fatal mistake. In ancient warfare, when the outer defences of a city were abandoned to the enemy, the fall of the citadel was only a question of time. There have been three classes of critics who have attacked Hebrew institutions.

1. Plausible skeptics and blatant infidels put the worst possible construction upon institutions which they either do not understand or else wilfully misconstrue and pervert. Their arraignment is sometimes little short of blasphemy against God himself.

2. Socinians represent a school of theology which calls itself Christian but denies the vicarious atonement of Christ and even his proper divinity. They profess to honor him as a great reformer and example to the race and a martyr for the truth. They must find something for this great human hero to do. They therefore pro-

nounce Mosaic institutions harsh, cruel, exclusive, bigoted, imperfect, impure and semi-barbaric. They teach that Christ was raised up a great prophet and reformer of the past. The orthodox view of the Old Testament dispensation would leave their Christ nothing to do.

3. The third class is composed of the higher critics. They minimize the supernatural. They practically deny direct revelation by inspiration and prophecy, authenticated by miracle. They deny the Mosaic origin of Hebrew institutions except in an inchoate form. They deny the divine authorship of these institutions in their complete and final form, at least. They maintain that God was the author only in the same sense in which he may have been the author of all other human institutions. They teach that these institutions were the product of centuries and the outgrowth of conditions according to nature's laws. They tell us that they were extremely rude and imperfect in their beginnings and that they were constantly reaching out for something better and higher. They occupy substantially the same position as the Socinians, except that no one is entitled to speak the last word. It is easy to see that this class holds to an evolutionary philosophy which they apply to both matter and mind in their unfolding and development.

It is not our purpose here to discuss and refute these three classes but only to enter a caveat against them all. We propose here merely to show the moral status of these institutions as set forth and claimed in the Scriptures. A correct analysis will show, however, that their criticisms are unfair and their contentions false.

The true doctrine is that both Testaments are equally pure, moral, benignant and perfect. The Scriptures amply justify and vindicate this claim, both in the Old and New Testaments. We may state the proof in several heads or categories.

1. The Scriptures claim it in varied forms of statement. In Psa. xix. 7-9, we read, "The law of the Lord is perfect"; "the fear of the Lord is pure"; "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether." These statements seem to be exhaustive.

The 119th Psalm leaves nothing to be added to this testimony. In 176 verses the Psalmist renders testimony to the law of the Lord, his commandments, his testimony, his ways, his precepts, his statutes, his judgments, his word, his works, his mercies, his righteousness and his truth. Their supreme excellency is asserted in every form of statement till nothing remains to be said. Let the critic revise these glorious testimonies and insert the words, harsh, cruel, exclusive, bigoted, imperfect, impure, semi-barbaric. He dares not to revise it so. Should he put a single slur into even one of the 176 categories he would excite a storm of indignation and he would be denounced as a blasphemer, and rightly so.

Paul agrees with the Psalmist in his estimate of the Old Testament legislation, Rom. vii. 12, "wherefore the law is holy and the commandments are holy and just and good." The context shows that he is discussing the Old Testament law. All the other writers in the New Testament utter the same either directly or by implication whenever pertinent.

Whether they were right or not, the writers of both Testaments believed in the holiness, righteousness, goodness, purity and perfection of all Bible institutions. They had no conception of any higher or better standard. Shall the skeptic, the Socinian or the higher critic furnish us a better standard and tell us how far, Moses and Daniel and David and Paul were mistaken?

2. If the Bible is God's word; if holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; if "God

in times past spake unto the fathers by the prophets"; if the prophets spake the truth when they said, ' "Thus saith the Lord"; and if the Psalmist was right when he said, "The law of the Lord is perfect," what need we more? Abraham said, "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right? The obvious claim of the Old Testament Scriptures is that God was the author of Hebrew institutions, civil, social and religious; and they are written out in multitudinous detail. If this be true, they are the expression and the product of his "wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth."

No criticism can be made upon these institutions which does not impugn one or more of God's infinite attributes. Human legislation is never complete, perfect and final because man's wisdom, power, holiness and goodness are finite and limited. He therefore needs an object lesson of God-given institutions and their fundamental principles. Such institutions are absolutely and eternally right. It is impossible for his works to contradict any one of his infinite attributes.

Adverse criticism of Bible institutions may be very devout in its beginnings, but its logical outcome and fruitage is the rejection of inspiration and the degredation of the Scriptures to the level of mere human literature of uncertain age and authority because of their great antiquity. If it does not dethrone God himself it removes him so far away from all concern in human institutions that it amounts to practical Atheism.

3. The decalogue is the perfect standard of morality, promulgated and enforced with the most awful sanctions. It is recognized from Genesis to Revelation. All institutions revolve about it. It was announced at Mt. Sinai as their all-pervading principle. The two tables of stone on which it was written are called the tables of the coven-

ant because the Theocratic covenant was based upon it, and all its provisions and administration comported with it. The two tables of the covenant were laid up in the ark of the covenant where no ruthless hand might touch them. The mercy seat was above them and this moral law was the foundation of his throne. David expressed it thus: "Judgment and truth are the habitation of thy throne.'

4. The purity and holiness of Moses' social and civil law is amply vindicated in the Sermon on the Mount. This sermon is the final word on Morals. But its utterances are not new. The Pharisees by their traditions had made void the law. Their glosses and interpretations had well nigh swept away true moral standards and eliminated them from their teaching and practice. The law-giver on Mt. Sinai and the law-expounder on the mount in Galilee exposed and swept away their false philosophy and morals and restored Old Testament morality to its true place in all social and civil relations. He did the same for their formalistic and emasculated worship and restored true worship, in matter, mode and spirit, as it had been from the beginning.

5. It is coming to be believed that the Old Testament does not sufficiently exalt the law of love. Let us see: "Thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart, with all thine soul, with all thy might"; "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Could language be stronger? Christ and John only reiterate this law of love and expose spurious imitations of it. Love of enemies, and kindly deeds are largely emphasized in precept and practice in both Testaments alike.

6. This law of love found expression in hospitality as a social force from the days of Abraham and Lot. Paul in Hebrews catches up the spirit of it, xiii. 2, "Be

not forgetful to entertain strangers for thereby some have entertained angels unawares." Other kindness to strangers and foreigners was frequently enjoined. Cf. Ex. xx. 21 and Levit. xix. 33, 34.

7. Mosaic provision for the poor and the poor Levite, not otherwise provided for, and for the poor foreigner is unique. The gleanings of their fields, their vineyards and their fruit trees were left for the poor. Ruth gleaning in the harvest of Boaz illustrates the working of this law. All the spontaneous products of the soil, the vintage and the fruits every seventh year belonged to the poor. The debts of the poor and unfortunate were cancelled every seventh year and Hebrew slaves were manumitted. Besides these things, a tithe was set aside every third year and laid up in the home to be disbursed as occasion required to the poor, and the poor Levites and the poor foreigner in the land. Where else have ever been found institutions of such open hand generosity?

8. We have noted in the last chapter that the exclusiveness charged against the institutions of Moses was not Mosaic but Pharisaic. There was one law for the home born and the stranger. Ex. xii. 48, 49. Equality before the law was a cardinal principle. Ex. xxii. 21; xxiii. 9. It would be easy to show that both proselytism and natural increase were the law of the growth of God's people from the days of Abraham down to the present time. Foreign proselytes were numerous in the time of David and of the Asmonean princes. During the dispersion they were reinforced by numerous proselytes enrolled in the Synagogue every where. The missionary spirit of Christianity is Abrahamic and Mosaic and is expressed both in the Psalms and the Prophets.

There are, however, certain customs and institutions, some real and some imaginary and some misunderstood, to which honest and devout critics have taken exception. They have felt justified in doing so under the assumption that the Mosaic system falls short of the moral standards of the New Testament. We have already discussed two of these, polygamy and the distinction of clean and unclean meats. We found that polygamy was not allowed by the Old Testament legislation and that the other was a valuable and beneficent institution. We propose to consider others in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VI.

OTHER SO-CALLED BLEMISHES.

The civil, the social and the moral in human institutions do so overlap each other in a concrete way that we may not discuss them analytically and separately, as the civil, or the social, or the moral. This is true of the institutions already discussed in the previous chapters.

All institutions are concrete and combine in themselves all three characteristics in varying prominence. For this reason we do not propose to adhere to any scientific classification of Hebrew institutions, while at the same time we hope to make the treatment in a proper sense exhaustive.

There are numerous matters of detail in civil and social usage, practice and administration which have been criticised more or less according to the prejudice, sentiments, hostility or the positive ignorance of the critics. No two critics feel it necessary to agree in their attitude toward many of their details. Some of these will be briefly noted in other connections not so much for confuting the critics as for setting forth Hebrew institutions as found in the Scriptures, rightly understood. It often happens that accurate analysis and true definition is the best refutation of error. The germs of certain diseases perish in sunlight. So error and falsehood shrivel and perish in the light of the truth.

There are, however, three institutions more which have been given great prominence in the attack upon the perfect moral purity of the Old Testament Scriptures. Many great and good men have been misled and have surrendered to these attacks, to the no small damage of the truth. These three are divorce, goelism and slavery.

These three in their various aspects have for a century past loomed up into tremendous importance, and the issues have been vital to the family, the church and the state. Modern divorce laws, private revenges and lynch law, the anti-slavery crusade and a man-made Bible and other cognate and collateral issues have been the outcome and the end of it is not yet.

The discussion of the Bible doctrine of slavery, as a social and civil institution, will be postponed for the present. It is sufficient to say here that it is easy to show that the teachings of the Old Testament and the New on this subject are the same, and their attitude is the same.

1. Divorce. The author has discussed the whole subject of divorce in the light of the entire Scriptures in a little volume, entitled "The Sermon on the Mount," Chapter VIII. It would be sufficient to refer the reader to that discussion if it were always practicable to do so. It will be necessary for this discussion to overlap the former discussion to a considerable extent, and some quotations will be taken from it where pertinent, with no notice except quotation marks.

The real issue is whether the Mosaic provision for divorce has any moral blemish. Or in other words, whether Christ does not agree with Moses, and whether Christ does not expound, uphold and reinforce the law of Moses in Deut. xxiv. 1-4 as against popular Pharisaic perversions thereof. If the law of Moses justified the Pharisaic doctrine of divorce it would indeed be a dreadful blemish on Hebrew institutions; but if Christ and Moses agree there is no blemish. The only alternative is to disclaim Christ as authority in such matters and to set up some more recent standard out of human consciousness, which is the last resort of rationalism.

We may quote Moses' law in full, Deut. xxiv. 1-4, "When a man has taken a wife and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his sight, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement and give it into her hand and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife. And if the latter husband hate her, and write for her a bill of divorcement and give it into her hand and send her out of his house; or if the latter husband die, which took her to be his wife, her former husband which sent her away may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled; for that is an abomination before the Lord; and thou shalt not cause the land to sin which the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance."

The Pharisees perverted and abused this divorce law and taught that a man might put away his wife for any cause. They evidently garbled the law, quoting these words, "If she find no favor in his eyes," omitting to note the ground or reason, "because he hath found some uncleanness in her."

Christ confutes them by assigning the one only grounds for divorce, fornication or adultery, Matt. xix. 3-9; Mark x. 2-12. He argues that the bond is indissoluble and was so from the beginning; that the law of divorce grew out of sin in the marriage relation; and that parties divorced for any other cause are not divorced at all, but do commit adultery when they marry again. We note briefly several propositions.

1. The divorce law of Moses was not a mere concession to perversity of temper and incompatibility, or a general "hardness of heart," but sin in the marriage relation.

2. "Moses and Christ agree that sin only and the same sin may justify a divorce. Moses says, "Because he had found some uncleanness in her." The original may be rendered "matter of nakedness." This is a technical term to indicate some form of lewdness and there is no reference to ceremonial and ritual uncleanness. It can only mean uncleanness in the marriage relation, "sexual sin." We are shut up to find the sin in the marriage relation—a perverse and dominant sinfulness—uncleanness, fornication, adultery."

3. "The divorce law of Moses is no mere expedient, lacking in clear-cut moral issues, for its last provision is fortified by these words, "For that is an abomination before the Lord: and thou shalt not cause the land to sin which the Lord thy God gave thee for an inheritance." In Levit. xviii. 3, 24-30 we learn the fatal defilement of the land by sexual abominations so that the land vomited out her inhabitants," the Canaanites—not an isolated case, but a universal law. Who then will challenge or impugn this God-given law of divorce, or defy its details?"

4. The Son of God was the law-giver to Moses and he was the law-expounder in the flesh. It is therefore impossible that Christ and Moses differ. "The Pharisees made the law void by their traditions"; and they had so defiled the land with their vicious divorcements and sexual abominations that it was nearly ready to vomit forth its people also, which did soon happen.

5. Moses' divorce law defined the rights of both parties in several particulars. Both the man and the

woman were equally entitled to redress: Christ and the Pharisees were agreed on this point. Both parties might marry again when properly divorced, and their right to do so was in no way affected by sin in the first marriage. The original parties were not allowed to remarry after the termination of the second marriage by divorce or death. Divorce was not issued except by due process of law under which a bill of writing or decree was issued and given to the parties for the protection of themselves and families and the community at large.

There are also other questions pertinent to the matter of divorce as discussed by Christ and Paul, but we need not raise them here because the only matter before us now is the law of divorce. We need not argue this further.

II. Goelism or the Avenging of Blood. The discussion of this institution leads us to consider the criminal jurisdiction of the olden time. It seems to have belonged to patriarchal forms of government in all ages, somewhat varied or modified in the details.

The fundamental idea is this. Whenever a murder or a man-slaughter is committed, a blood avenger undertakes to overtake the murderer and execute judgment on him. The blood avenger is presumably a brother or some one duly appointed to do so. The original idea seems to have been to redeem life with life and blood with blood. Redemption, ransom, and expiation are an essential part of the idea. In pure patriarchism, each large family or tribe is independent and there is no common jurisprudence. The Goel or Blood avenger seeks to punish the guilty and supersedes the necessity of tribal wars to that end, and is so far beneficent; and the matter usually ends when the guilty party pays the ransom price with his own blood.

However, this institution is capable of great abuses as also are other forms of criminal jurisprudence. It sometimes degenerated into family feuds and bloody reprisals running sometimes for generations. The novelist has not been slow to portray such things in the most vivid and thrilling way so that the very name, avenger of blood, in popular estimation, stands for all that is cruel, vengeful and relentless. The critics are not slow to condemn Hebrew institutions because they there find Goelism in a modified form.

We may suspect that an institution of such antiquity is rooted in some great necessity or condition, and is based on fundamental principles and is really indispensible to the welfare of those among whom it is found. Nay more, we have a right to suspect it to be of divine origin and appointment. Let us examine into the matter.

In the ninth chapter of Genesis we find the covenant made with Noah when he came out of the ark. It is the bill of rights for the race. In verse 6 we find blood avenging enjoined, "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." In verse 5 we read, "And surely the blood of your lives will be required; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of every man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man." The brother is definitely named as the responsible party to see to it that in case of murder life shall be redeemed with life and blood with blood. This would seem to be the origin of Goelism as a permanent institution in all family and tribal forms of government for all ages down to the present time. It has been modified as patriarchism yielded to other forms of government and has wholly disappeared in highly organized modern governments. But even here the old instinct often times assert itself in personal revenges, family feuds and lynch law.

The word brother has three senses in connection with the institution of Goelism; first, an actual brother; second, a cousin or other near kinsman; and, third, a blood brother, made so by a blood covenant—by a transfusion of blood either actually of symbolically. This blood covenant is still in use among many tribes and peoples, and establishes the strongest possible bonds. The blood brother stakes his life and his all to protect, defend, redeem and avenge his brother, and all responsibility therefor is transferred to him and he becomes the recognized tribal official to represent all his people with whom he has entered into blood covenant relations.

It would be of great interest here to trace the blood covenant relations of Christ to his people from circumcision, which he calls "the blood of my covenant," all through the symbolisms of sacrificial bloody rites till he instituted the cup as the New Testament in his own blood, appointed by our blood brother who has redeemed us by giving us his blood for our blood, his life for our lives. Such a discussion would, however, lead us too far from our present purpose. Suffice it to say that Job says, "I know that my Goel liveth," my blood brother—"my Redeemer."

At Mount Sinai patriarchal institutions were greatly modified. Families and tribes were organized into a commonwealth. Family, church and state were adjusted to each other. Constitutional government with several branches superseded patriarchal rule in large measure. All forms of crime including murder and manslaughter were brought within the jurisdiction of the graded courts. We might expect to find the office and functions of the Goel or blood avenger greatly modified; and such was the case. Cities of refuge were appointed to which the man who had slain his fellow man might flee for protection till he had a fair trial before competent courts. The principle was established that the prison was appointed to throw the strong arm of the state around the suspected criminal for his protection rather than to punish him.

It is true that the blood avenger might slay the man before he reached the city of Refuge. In that case it was set down to heat of blood, just as may happen to-day in any well-ordered government. It is probable that the Goel was also the official public prosecutor before the courts in behalf of the state. If so, however, it was no blemish.

If the man was found guilty of death, he was handed over to the Goel who was made the executioner of a just and righteous sentence; and the witnesses were his official assistants. In this we find nothing to criticize or censure.

If the man was justified or acquitted he was required to remain as a citizen of the city of Refuge, where his family might join him till the death of the high priest. No reason is assigned for this but we may mention at least two. It gave time for hot blood to cool; and it emphasized the serious nature of manslaughter even though the courts pronounced it justifiable.

Thus we see that the possible abuses of Goelism were safe-guarded; the danger of family feuds and private revenges was reduced to a minimum; and the Goel was made an official of a well-ordered state for the administration of justice. We find no traces of the blood avenger in Hebrew jurisprudence after the captivity, and that for the reason that the remains of patriarchism were broken up by the captivity, never to be restored, and serious changes became necessary in church and state.

Need we argue this matter further?

CHAPTER VII.

THE GENIUS AND SPIRIT OF HEBREW INSTITUTIONS.

We study human institutions not so much to note details, as to discover underlying principles. These principles do often show varied forms of development which in their essence are substantially the same. No one people may exactly copy the forms and patterns of another irrespective of their several traditions and the numerous and varied forces which contributed to make their history.

All Jewish institutions claim to be God-given and they embody principles absolutely sound; while their exact form has all the earmarks of their earlier history, just as in other cases. These divine institutions seem to be handed down to us in sufficient detail to reveal every necessary principle but not for slavish imitation. Some of the books containing details seem to have been lost. The Scriptures refer to these books and sometimes quote from them as authority as we shall see later on.

It is the object of this chapter to note the genius and spirit of the people as indicated in their institutions.

1. They were an agricultural people rather than commercial. Agriculture was exalted as the leading pursuit and as the basis of the nation's power. There is constant reference to tillage, vine-dressing, orchards, fruits, flocks and herds. Their tithes were paid in kind, oil and wine and grain from the threshing floor. The tax levies of David and Solomon and the tribute from conquered and subject peoples were immense, and consisted largely of agricultural products. Palestine was the granary for

the Phoenecians in their commerce and carrying trade. Later in the history it was the coveted granary; and it became the battle ground of nations because of its immense agricultural resources.

Their lands could not be permanently alienated from the families to which they belonged, but could be redeemed at any time on equitable terms, and all alienations of land were cancelled at the year of Jubilee. This provision of redemption and return of lands was purely in the interest of agriculture, for houses and lots in walled cities were permanently alienated when sold and were not subject to redemption or return.

In all this they differed from the nations of antiquity, Athens, Sparta and the Greek peoples generally who remanded agriculture to be Helots, a semi-servile class with no civil rights. The Hindoos, Egypt, Carthage and Rome pursued the same general policy. Even down to recent times the serf and the tenant have been transferred with the soil as if rooted in it, while the higher classes pursued what they considered nobler callings.

2. Foreign commerce and naval enterprises were discouraged. Internal commerce is not speculative. There were three great caravan routes through Palestine carrying the trade of the East and of Egypt; and the traffic with these merchants was the source of great prosperity within their borders. The Phoenecians of Tyre and Sidon were on their borders and their relations were so intimate that their commerce was more like home traffic and consisted largely of barter, exchanging their agricultural products for skilled labor and for such building materials as must come by water transportation, of which they had none.

Foreign commerce is speculative and is ambitious to acquire large profits and great wealth. In those days it took great risks and its rewards must be in proportion. They had no suitable harbor on the Mediterranean Sea and the navigation of the Red Sea from Elath and Ezion Gaber was dangerous.

Solomon overcame great obstacles and his ships traded to India, to the West and East coasts of Africa as far as the British Isles, and then along the shores of the Mediterranean Sea as far as Italy, and back again home after a cruise of three years, laden with fabulous stores of gold and silver and precious stones and ivory and spices.

He also built Tadmor in the desert, the Palmyra of ancient renown, as the entrepot for the overland commerce of Central Asia and India. His countless wealth from these sources and from his foreign gold and silver mines introduced extravagance, effeminacy, luxury and corruption. Profligacy begat oppression in turn while the divine law claimed its revenges. Moses in Deut. vii. 16, had said that the king should "not greatly multiply gold and silver."

When subsequent kings sought to reopen this foreign commerce, which had been destroyed by the Syrians and the Edomites, providential disasters on the stormy Red Sea caused its final abandonment.

It may not be amiss to contrast agriculture and commerce in their general tendencies. Agriculture fosters the sturdy virtues, courage, patriotism, independence of spirit, simplicity of habits, economy, hospitality and mutual helpfulness. Simple morality and religious faiths and practices find their best nursery among agricultural peoples. It also favors equalities of fortune and solid distribution of wealth.

On the other hand, wherever a commercial spirit dominates a people a mercenary habit is found to prevail. All great questions are viewed from a commercial point of view. Personal interests and community interests give complexion both to home and foreign relations. It fosters large accumulations of wealth in the hands of a few on one hand and extremes of poverty on the other. The great wealth tends to luxury, corruption and the vices of the rich and their envious imitations; and the dire poverty means degradation and the appalling vices of the "submerged tenth." This mercenery spirit dictates both war and peace in a shameful way. Class legislation in the course of time dominates all departments of business and the very reaction against it gets its inspiration from the same source and is hopelessly vitiated thereby. We need not stop here to verify this contrast from history.

3. Several things conspired to discourage extremes of wealth and poverty. Their usury laws were unique. They were not permitted to charge interest on money lent to a brother Hebrew, and thus speculate on his necessities. They might lend on interest to any foreigner who evidently used it for speculative purposes. Such loans could not have been general because of the risk and lack of facilities of collection.

There was a general bankrupt law that cancelled all debts every seventh year. This made it impossible for the money lender to grind the faces of the poor. It is true, however, that the law gave the creditor every facility to collect his money up to the year of Jubilee. This provision was not only just and righteous but it counteracted the tendency of a bankrupt law to debauch the honesty of the debtor. The entire provision tended to generosity on the part of the creditor.

The redemption and release of lands that had been alienated and their return to the family has already been mentioned. It is easy to see how this provision prevented the depths of poverty. It is easy also to see how these three things combined discouraged extremes of wealth and poverty.

4. Standing armies have always been a menace to liberties of a people. Standing armies were contrary to the genius of Hebrew institutions. After the conquest of the land under the leadership of the Lord as commander-in-chief, and Joshua, his chief captain, the people settled down to the peaceable pursuits of life and there was no need of armies. Whenever predatory bands of foreign invaders, or even great warlike kings attacked them, call was made for patriot volunteers to repel the foe. These volunteers carried their own provisions and even furnished their own weapons. They returned home at once when the foe had been repulsed.

5. In the accounts we read of ancient armies and warfare we find great prominence given to horses, horsemen, and chariots. Agriculture was carried on with oxen and cattle. The ass and the mule were used for riding and the horse for military purposes only. The Arab's steed to this day is his war horse.

Now the king was expressly forbidden to bring in horses from Egypt. Even when horses were captured in war they were houghed and thus rendered unfit for anything except to be used with the ox in agriculture. Foreign aggressive war was quite impossible without horses and chariots.

The Hebrews waged no aggressive wars for foreign conquest. David's wars of conquest, in which he annexed Edom, Moab, Ammon, Syria and the Philistines, grew out of invasions of his kingdom by confederated foes. He could not stop short of their complete conquest. These conquests and the extension of his kingdom had been foretold and promised centuries before. Nor was it accomplished in violation of the true spirit of his institutions.

5. Other nations and peoples made war the normal condition. Peace, with them, was a truce for a season. War was surrounded with all the sanctions of their religion. The God of war was invoked as their chosen hero. Virtue (virtus) with them was the manhood of the military hero. Not so with God's commonwealth and people. They relied on him to make their enemies to be at peace with them. Every man was required to attend the three feasts at Jerusalem and they had a definite promise that their enemies should not molest their homes at those periods. There was the same promise with reference to their observance of the Sabbatical year. These same religious usages made foreign aggressive wars impossible.

6. Their religious usages and God's promise conspired to make them a peace-loving nation. We shall show later on that the genius and spirit as well as the form of their institutions were republican. We pause here to note that republican institutions are essentially non-aggressive and peace-loving. The fathers of our country took pride in their republican simplicity as opposed to the pomp and pageant and court dress and escutcheons and decorations of monarchs and kings and their courts.

Over and over again in countless cases God's people verified the promise "if a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." This also, "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

CONCLUSION.

Several questions here emerge.

1. Why were the Israelites so often afflicted with foreign invasions? The Scriptures give no uncertain answer. They were not faithful to their covenants, their institutions and their God.

2. Why was Saul's kingdom so disastrous to himself and people when it started out so auspiciously? We answer, the demand of the people for a king was based on a desire for the pomp and pageantry of warlike nations, and a desire for foreign conquest. Saul began by organizing a standing army of 3,000 men, in violation of the principles we are discussing. But when he needed an army and called for patriot volunteers, only 600 men answered the call—his standing army all gone.

3. Why was David's kingdom swept with a plague for three days and 70,000 people perished? Because he had numbered the people. He made a great military census of his people. He mobilized the entire military strength of his kingdom. His people demanded it, stirred up by Satan. They coveted military glory and universal empire, and the time seemed opportune.

4. Why did the great and glorious kingdom of David and Solomon disintegrate and decay? They violated the genius and spirit of their institutions in so many ways.

CHAPTER VIII.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

In human institutions there are three elements, the social, the religious and the civil. These are the sources of all authority and lie at the basis of all government. The social grows into the family as its unit and expression. The religious is found embodied in the church and the civil crystallizes into the state. These some how find a mutual adjustment in ordinary cases. These three often overlap each other; and one of them often absorbs and dominates the other.

Patriarchism was the earliest form of government and the source of authority was in the family. The family was both the church and the state. The social, the religious and the civil were co-ordinate factors in the family. The patriarch was the prophet, priest and king in his family or tribe. In the course of time people multiplied, the family became unwieldy and outgrew its original constitution.

This was the case with Israel in Egypt and they must needs be organized and formed into a nation. This was not left to be done in a haphazard way subject to all the civil forces that have prevailed among the many nations and peoples in all ages. Satan's favorite haunts are found in the domiciles of human power and his handiwork is seen in the enginery of human oppression, for he is the "Prince of this world." No mere human government has escaped his domination to a greater or less extent.

The term "world powers" has become the synonym for organized evil. The old "world powers" made shipwreck on the shores of time because Satan was at the helm. Egypt and Assyria and Babylon perished because fundamental principles were violated, and so with Greece and Rome. If modern nations are builded on better foundations they will endure. Otherwise, they shall rush to ruin like the house built on the sand and great will be the fall thereof.

If, however, modern Christian governments are built on better foundations we may inquire, whence came the better fundamental principles? It is a favorite theory of the author that all that is good in human institutions is of divine origin, and is to be found in the Scriptures, either expressly or by necessary implication; and that all heresies are met and refuted therein. We argue also that governments are good or bad according as they approximate or diverge from the "Pattern showed in the Mount." The sole purpose of this little volume is to vindicate and illustrate these views.

Israel in Egypt grew into a numerous people. Twelve families became twelve great tribes. They were led out of Egypt toward Palestine, the land of covenant promise, which they must soon conquer with the sword, and occupy as a great and powerful people.

They were led aside and sojourned for a year at Mt. Sinai. There they received from God, through Moses, institutions far reaching and comprehending all relations human and divine in exhaustive details. These have been written out in such a way that we call their institutions constitutional. And besides we have long historic accounts of their working.

The prime object of Sinaitic legislation was to adjust the family and the church to the state. It promulgated a perfect moral code and made it the foundation of all the rest and the supreme test of all. The two tables of stone, inscribed by the finger of God, were placed in the Ark of the Covenant, underneath the mercy seat where Jehovah sat to administer the covenant.

We assume here the completeness of the God-given form of government. We propose to analyze this commonwealth and name and define its nature, its rulers, its officers, assemblies and courts, in the succeeding chapters. We propose to discover the checks and balances provided to prevent the dangerous usurpations so prominent in the history of other nations.

Aristocracies have in all ages been the bane of good government, and subversive of republican institutions. Aristocracy is a seven-headed Hydra. We may show how Mosaic institutions were safe-guarded against them all.

1. *Blooded Aristocracy.*—There was no civil caste of blood or birth. This has been perhaps the most common form of aristocracy and its claims have been almost universally conceded. Small ruling classes under various names have dominated social and civil life, and have handed down their titles from father to son, and the masses of the people have recognized their right to rule, and fought their battles, and upheld their claims with wonderful loyalty. The literal meaning of the word "Aristocracy" is the "rule of the best." But history has marked its degeneration into the rule of the worst. This form of aristocracy was ruled out by the elective features of the Hebrew commonwealth which will be discussed in another chapter.

We may note further that they had no servile class except foreign slaves. Jewish slaves were freed every seventh year. There was no serf nor peasant class with limited citizenship, but all the callings of life were equally honorable.

There are certain apparent exceptions to our contention. One is the birthright usages. They were more obvious in the patriarchal system, but were modified into mere family rules for inheritances, and carried with them the obligation to provide for dependent members of the family. But we find no evidence of a first-born or a birthright caste in the state claiming the right to rule.

The other apparent exception is the fact that the kingdom was handed down from father to son in David's line. In reply, we say that there was no such rule of succession as we find in the Salic Law of Europe, but the kings were chosen on entirely different principles which we hope to discover when we discuss the manner of the kingdom.

2. *Landed Aristocracy.*—We see examples of this in many countries ancient and modern. Lands gradually accumulated in the hands of a few by royal grants and by gradual purchase till large landed estates carried upon them large populations of tenants, and even whole towns and villages. The landlord sometimes lived in his castle on his possessions, or more often in a distant metropolis, and ruled his subject tenants by agents and stewards and bailiffs. We need hardly recite here the evils of such a system, its misrule and oppressions.

There was small possibility of such a system under Mosaic institutions. Their land tenures were permanent in that they could not be permanently alienated from the family inheritance. Misfortune, lack of thrift or other causes might compel the sale of the homestead, but the title reverted to the family at the year of Jubilee, or it might be redeemed on equitable terms at any time before the year of release. The prophet denounces all attempts to the contrary: "Woe unto them that join house to house, and lay field to field till there be no place," Is. v. 8. All this is in beautiful contrast with the landed aristocracy of Rome, and of Great Britain and Ireland, and the agitations, rebellions and throes of their own down-trodden peoples.

3. *Monied Aristocracy.*—This has perhaps been more baneful and unscrupulous than either of the two aforementioned. Great accumulations of wealth in the hands of a few have not been slow to promote class legislation in the interest of the few at the expense of the masses. Tariffs, concessions, franchises and monopolies of all kinds are seized upon and made to do duty in the interests of plutocracy. The power of great riches is measureless if properly organized. The extreme poverty of the "submerged tenth" is the necessary resultant because they lose their balance and fall out of line in the mad rush. It is the other pole of the battery. All political economists agree that extremes of wealth and poverty are mutual products and mischievous.

There were two safeguards against these extremes. One was their usury laws. It is well known that money at interest grows rapidly, and money lenders have no limit to the rate they charge except the urgency of the borrowers' necessities, or the strong arm of the law. It is usually easy for the unscrupulous to evade the law which limits the rate. A farming people have little need to borrow money except in case of some kind of disaster, and in such case he can ill afford to pay interest, if indeed he can repay the principal. They were not allowed to charge their brethren for the use of the loan, for these and other obvious reasons. This provision cut off from riches the main source of their growth. When the poor man falls into the hands of the money lender the end is not far to see. His small holdings are soon swallowed up in the rapacious maw of the money shark; his productive powers are also confiscated and enslaved for the future; and his very credit destroyed for all time to come. These obvious evils were further minimized by a second provision.

All debts were released every seven years. Unfortunate burdens were removed by a general bankrupt law. The effect of this was twofold. It retarded the rapid growth of riches and even depleted its plethora, and also prevented the chronic insolvency of the poor.

These two provisions had another incidental value. It retarded an inordinate craving for great riches, and encouraged generosity in lending to the poor without gilt-edged security. In Deut. xv. 6-9, we find this form of generosity argued and enjoined with definite promise of divine favor. Comp. Matt. v. 42.

4. *Military Aristocracy.*—Military ambition has been and is universal. Military glory has overshadowed all other. There is a spontaneous loyalty to the military hero and patriot, and there ought to be. The maidens of Israel, with timbrels and dances, sang "Saul hath slain his thousand and David his tens of thousands." But how many nations and peoples have suffered from military domination!

The two safeguards against this have been mentioned in another connection. One was absolute dependence on volunteer armies in time of war. Joab like Cincinnatus returned to his plow when the war was over. Standing armies were discouraged and always wrought mischief whenever they exceeded a mere constabulary or police force. Military leaders were not, *ipso facto,* civil rulers. Republics have always had a wholesome fear of standing armies lest they lose their liberties thereby.

The other safeguard against a military aristocracy was the prohibition of horses, horsemen and chariots, Deut. xvii. 16. The mounted class have always claimed and maintained a superior rank in history. The Equites, horsemen or knights, in the days of Rome were always prominent and sometimes dominated the commonwealth, and afterwards the empire. They absorbed into themselves every noble Roman youth who had either civil or military ambition; and the comitia, the senate, the civilian and the soldier alike bowed before them. We need hardly cite the influence and power of the knights in the days of chivalry throughout Europe and among the Saracens. Militarism was sorely punished and rebuked whenever it took possession of the hearts of the Hebrew people—twice at least.

5. *Priestly Aristocracy.*—The nations of antiquity were all more or less under priestly domination. This was the result of three things. They used the sanctions of their religions for their own aggrandizement; and they gradually acquired property free from all taxation till their hierarchies became very rich and powerful. They claimed and received large revenues from the state in the name of religion. Medieval and modern history furnishes the most conspicuous example in the usurpations of the Papacy till she claimed authority over all civil governments as the viceroy of heaven; and half the lands in Europe were held by the church and her religious orders in mortmain; and untold revenues were extorted in the name of tithes, Peter's Pence, indulgencies, and masses for the dead. And the end is not yet. In this

way nations and peoples have been so priest-ridden as to require centuries of struggle to shake it off.

Such a state of things was impossible in Hebrew institutions. The priests were made the servants of the people. They could not accumulate large possessions of houses and lands or any other form of ecclesiastical foundations. Their only support consisted of the voluntary contributions of the people. These contributions depended on the spirituality of the people, which depended in turn upon the fidelity and consecration of the ministers of religion. Their tithes were self-assessed, voluntary offerings and not taxes as many suppose. God has never given the purse strings of his people to any hierarchy. Nothing but corruption and oppression could come of such a thing. The entire scheme was self-adjusting. The official fidelity of ministers of religion and their spirituality was rewarded by a conscientious support from the people. The history shows that in times of great religious declension the tithes were withheld until the priest turned aside to provide a support in secular pursuits, "every man to his field."

6. *Literary Aristocracy.*—In India the Brahmins have been a great literary caste of rank and power and their influence is not yet broken, or superseded, though effete and decaying. A gigantic literary aristocracy has ruled in China for centuries of misrule and oppression. There has been little or none of it among western peoples; except when it has been ancillary to priestly domination.

The Levites were the literary class in Israel. They were not only priests' assistants at the Tabernacle and the Temple, but they seem to have had charge of the education of the people. They were the servants of the people and were supported by their voluntary tithes. They never seem to have aspired to be a literary aristocracy.

7. *Prescriptive Aristocracy.*—It sometimes happens that an oligarchy which cannot be fairly classified under either of the above heads gets possession of a state and continues so long in possession that they claim continued possession as a matter of right, and their claim is ofttimes recognized. Revolutions, civil wars and seditious practices frequently grow out of these claims, and the people suffer for the ambitions of such oligarchy. What we call boss rule and machine politics in this country is the predominance of prescriptive oligarchies, and true liberty is lost in conflicting personal interests.

We find but little evidence of prescriptive rights in exercise in Jewish history. There is no special provision against it. We may, however, find that its absence is due to the general equilibrium of their institutions and to the prominence given to the liberties of the people.

Conclusion.—We may now cite several obvious corrolaries from this discussion.

1. The universal distribution of lands and the general ownership of homes favored the general equality of the people.

2. No family remained long below a freehold. This tended to maintain personal independence and a true patriotism.

3. Passages like Ex. ii. 2; Levit. xxvi. 13; xix. 18, expounded in Matt. vii. 12, are essentially republican in spirit and gave guaranty of civil freedom and equality.

4. The entire scheme tended to the liberty and equality of all. The rich and the poor were brethren and the family spirit pervaded the entire people.

5. This was promoted further by a perfect code of laws and a wise judicial system.

6. So far, we classify their government as constitutional republicanism. We learn further from Deut. xxxi. 9, 24-26, and other places that all the details of these God-given institutions were carefully written and carefully guarded and preserved under the most sacred sanctions.

CHAPTER IX.

THE ELECTIVE FEATURES OF THE REPUBLIC.

Pure patriarchism means the rule of the father. This was a system of family government. Birth and age gave authority. Seniority gave the right to rule—"Elders." This name and title has been handed down the ages. The Boule of the Greeks was a council of the elders or chiefs; so also the senatus or seniores, the older men of the Latins, down to modern senates and "aldermen." The term "elder" is used through the Scriptures as the synonym for ruler and counsellor, implying age, experience, wisdom and official position.

When the Hebrew people came out of Egypt there were seventy elders of the more primitive type, who bare rule in patriarchal form throughout their families and tribes. They consisted of fifty-eight heads of families, and twelve Phylarchs or heads of tribes, making seventy in all. These were evidently elders of patriarchal type and they attained their official position by virtue of their seniority. Moses treated with them when he returned from Midian to deliver his people from Egypt. We need not make further mention of them at this time.

Under the Mosaic commonwealth rank and rule by reason of birth and family relations was superseded by election. Patriarchism was modified into elective republicanism.

We may remark here that Hebrew legislation and constitutions are not promulgated in categorical statements and definitions as in our day, but they are given in concrete form and pertinent examples. Careful analysis and an exhaustive induction is necessary in order to ascertain essential principles and their administration. Concrete institutions are based on fundamental principles and are not the result of accident nor mere convention. Whatever may be claimed of the natural and instinctive growth or evolutionary production of other institutions, there was no place for such a theory at Mt. Sinai. Moses and Mosaic institutions were not the product of environment and natural law, if the Bible is true.

It is not our purpose here to defend the truth of the Scriptures, but to expound them, and to discover the supreme excellence of these God-given institutions.

We shall cite a large number of concrete facts as examples of election, free, voluntary, and essential. There is no formal definition of the elective franchise, but numerous examples of its use.

1. The Lord, Jehovah, was elected civil ruler and king at Mt. Sinai. He met Moses on the mount and sent him down to the people to propose to them the Theocratic covenant by which he should be their God and king and they should be his people. This was not a religious covenant merely. They were living under it already just as all other people who love and serve him. We shall discuss the nature of the theocracy in another chapter. Suffice it to say that they voted unanimously for the proposed covenant. Ex. xix. 3-8. "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." They reiterated the same when Moses reported back from the Lord his words and his will. Ex. xxiv. 3, 4.

This same covenant was again ratified by unanimous vote in the plains of Moab just before Moses' death.

Deut. xxvi. 16-19. It was resubmitted in the next generation by Joshua in his farewell address, and the vote was unanimous and hearty. Josh. xxiv. 15-22. This covenant was often renewed afterwards by vote and by oath. We need not argue the special obligations which arose from this voluntary election.

2. The graded judiciary was elected. We shall discuss this judiciary in another chapter. Suffce it now to note its election. By comparing Ex. xvii. 23-26 and Deut. i. 9-18, we find that Jethro proposed, the Lord approved, and the people voted for the plan. Then they elected the judges and Moses installed them into office and charged them with their duties.

3. The spies sent out from Kadesh-barnea were elected or chosen for the purpose and sent by Moses. The people proposed it unanimously, the Lord approved it and bade them take a ruler of each tribe; and Moses charged them with their duties. Compare Num. xiii. 1-20, and Deut. i. 22.

4. Joshua's succession to Moses did not rest solely on divine direction and appointment by Moses, but the people voted to sustain him unanimously and heartily. Josh. i. 16-18, "All that thou commandest we will do." They denounced death to any who might rebel.

5. The dividers of the land were elected. After five of the tribes had been located it was necssary to make a survey of the remaining land for division—a most responsible work which occupied thirty-six men nine months. Joshua said, "Give out from among you three men from each tribe, and I will send them, etc., and they shall divide the land into seven parts." This is a clear case of selection by election.

6. The Judges of the Book of Judges were special delivers who were raised up when needed, usually in

some crisis, or in some great disaster and oppression by enemies. They were extraordinary offcers, both military and civil, somewhat like the dictator among the Romans who was expected to save the commonwealth, its traditions and its laws when put in jeopardy by external foes or internal seditions.

These extraordinary Judges were thirteen in number and were equipped and inspired for their work. Even they did not exercise their extraordinary powers without the consent of their people, for there is evidence that these judges were also elected. We learn from Judges xi. 1-11, that Jephthah was solicited to deliver Israel out of the hand of the Ammonites. The elders of Gilead, the chief sufferers, made him "head and captain over them," and he "uttered all his words before the Lord at Mizpah," i. e., he was regularly inducted into office by the oath of the Lord.

We may consider this a typical case; and we have all the negotiations and other details carefully recorded. We may fairly infer that the other twelve judges were elected and inducted into office in the same way. There is no reason to suppose that any of them took the reigns of government of their own motion. Besides, we would hardly expect to find in such brief histories all the details of their election and inauguration in each case. No doubt there was a divine call or election and also a human election just as in the case of the kings afterward. It may not be amiss to mention that after Gideon delivered Israel out of the hands of the Midianites they requested or elected him to rule over thm, presumably as king, but he refused, saying, "The Lord shall rule over you." He did, however, judge Israel all his days.

7. The kingdom was an elective monarchy. This saved the republican character of the commonwealth.

Such a monarchy does not interfere with free institutions.

The kingdom was a part of the original plan. Moses laid down the necessary qualifications of the king and defined certain of his duties. Deut. xvii. 14-20. In this brief constitution of the kingdom we find this, the recognition of a unique provision for a divine nomination and a human election. When thou "shalt say, I will set a king over me like as all the nations that are about me; thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose; one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee."

Several centuries passed before the setting up of the kingdom as Moses provided for. When it was done due prominence was given to the principle of a double election, as we shall see.

During Samuel's administration as judge the people made their demand for a king and the Lord bade Samuel to accede to their demand, after explaining all the risks envolved, as found in 1 Sam. Chapter viii. Samuel was divinely guided to anoint Saul the Son of Kish to be king, and he confirmed his faith by several signs. Soon afterwards, "Samuel called the people together unto the Lord to Mizpah," for the purpose of making a king. The divine choice was further published and emphasized in the public assembly by casting lots. And the final lot fell on Saul. The people ratified the nomination and they made him king. "Then Samuel told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord." Thus we see that the monarchy was also "constitutional" and "limited."

The election by the people was not unanimous and there was much disaffection. Saul soon gathered a volunteer army of 330,000 and delivered Jabesh Gilead out of the hands of the Ammonites with complete rout and great slaughter. In the very flush and glory of the victory Samuel called the people together to Gilgal to renew the kingdom. "And they made Saul king before the Lord in Gilgal" with sacrifices of peace offerings and great joy. We find all these things in 1 Samuel, Chapters ix, x, xi.

The next king, David, received the divine nomination and was anointed by Samuel at Bethlehem his home in connection with a sacrificial feast. It soon became an open secret, for Johnathan adhered to his cause, and Saul, once at least, recognized the fact that David would be king, and made him swear that he would deal kindly with his family. 1 Sam. xxiv. 20-22.

After Saul's death David went up to Hebron in Judah, by divine direction; and the men of Judah came and made him king. Their election of David as king made him king of Judah only and not over the other tribes who adhered to the house of Saul under the leadership of Abner who was really a military usurper. David had war with him, but not for conquest nor for to assert any claim to be king over those tribes. So the matter stood for seven years.

Then Abner, partly from spite and partly from the ambition to be David's chief captain in a reunited kingdom, bargained with David to bring those tribes over to David's banner. His assassination by Joab defeated his schemes which seem not to have been entirely devoid of treachery. It seems from his own admission that they had sought David in times past to be king over them, and he had evidently prevented it till his own ambitions led the way. 2 Sam. iii. 17, 18.

After other treacheries which were promptly punished, "All the elders of the tribes of Israel came to David to Hebron, and they made a league with David and they made him king over Israel.

In the case of subsequent kings we find fewer details of their selection. In Solomon's case the divine nomination is quite prominent. David had him formally anointed and inducted in to office amid popular demonstrations of great joy.

After Solomon the kingdom was divided. Jeroboam certainly had the double election. In the case of Rehoboam the election by Judah is evident and we may take the other for granted.

In the northern kingdom there were several changes of dynasty by usurpers. In the case of Jehu he had the divine nomination and first his army proclaimed him and then the people made him king. No doubt, as the kingdoms waned constitutional provisions were often ignored and violated.

We find the parallel to this double election in Acts i. 15-21. The apostles and 120 disciples at Jerusalem proceeded to fill the place of Judas Iscariot. They chose out two having the necessary qualifications and having prayed they cast lots and the lot fell on Mattathias and he was numbered with the eleven. This double election was not unfamiliar to Jews, who understood their own institutions.

8. We are now prepared to argue that free government is of divine origin and warrant, and that the right of election and choice of rulers depends upon compliance with the God-given warrant. We find it first suggested by Jethro to Moses at Mount Sinai and then to God for approval, and it was engrafted into their elective system. "Thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness; and place

such over them, to be rulers of thousands and rulers of hundreds, and rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens."

Need we argue the necessity of these four qualifications for rulers—able men, that fear an oath, men of truth, hating covetousness? As long as the terms of this warrant are complied with good government is the result. Otherwise misgovernment and the final forfeiture of the right of self government ensues. We read in Eccl. x. 17, "Woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child, and when thy princes eat in the morning; blessed art thou, O land, when thy king is the son of nobles, and thy princes eat for strength, and not for drunkenness." In Prov. xxix. 2 we read, "When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice; but when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn." All so-called inailenable rights are conditioned on a warrant. Violate the warrant and rights are forfeited. We need not argue this further.

We need to distinguish Jewish republicanism from a pure democracy. In the former the elected ruler was an actual ruler, elected because of his character and qualifications. In the latter the ruler is a mere agent or office holder to do the bidding of those who appointed him. In the former citizenship did not carry with it universal suffrage for all rulers nor the universal right to hold office as we shall see later. Besides, the elders or representatives of the first degree above the people were the electors for many rulers. The kings, for example, were elected by the elders. Many rulers and judges were thus removed from popular suffrage. The demand of modern democracy to remand every thing to popular suffrage has no countenance in Hebrew institutions and is alien to the divine model.

CHAPTER X.

NATURE OF THE HEBREW COMMONWEALTH.

We have seen that Jewish civil institutions were republican, having the right of election and representative free government. This right of election embraced all rulers from the lowest captain over tens to the highest, whether judges or kings. Some of these elections were primary, that is, by popular vote; some were secondary, i. e., election by elders, and some were tertiary, i. e., appointment by high officials. We loosely call their institutions democratic, but their government was not a democracy. These things have already been sufficiently discussed. The corresponding form of church government is called Presbyterianism, and dates back to the organization of the Synagogue during or after the captivity.

There were twelve tribes organized into a commonwealth, and they were equal units. Levi was not counted, because they were set apart as ministers of religion. They had no civil organization, nor tribal inheritance assigned to them. They were assigned to forty-eight Levitical cities which were scattered throughout the twelve tribes for service, educational and religious. Their civil rights were reduced to a minimum, which was every way proper. It ought always so to be, as a safeguard against priestly domination. Joseph was not counted formally and by name, but his two sons were made the heads of two tribes co-ordinate with the others. Gen. xlviii. 5; Josh. xiv. 3, 4.

These twelve tribes had each local self-government by cities and by tribes, to-wit:

1. Each tribe had a phylarch or governor, called, "head," "prince," "chief." The names of the twelve phylarchs when Moses first numbered the people are found in the first chapter of Numbers. They are also called, "The renowned of the tribes of Israel," "Princes of the tribes of their fathers," and "Heads of the thousands of Israel. Num. i. 1-16; Josh. ix. 15; xxii. 14.

2. These phylarchs were the civil and military heads of the tribes. The numbering of the people by Moses was a military census, and each phylarch was the commander- in-chief of the armies in his own tribe. This military organization antedated the formation of the commonwealth. The object of the census was to train and prepare them for war, and for the conquest of the land of Canaan. They were now in the transition from patriarchal to a more consolidated form of government.

There is no positive evidence that there had previously been heads of tribes in addition to the fifty-eight patriarchal heads of families, though there is no evidence to the contrary. But it is every way likely. They had developed some form of military organization and drill in Egypt for we are told that they went up "harnessed" (four abreast), and certainly by tribes.

We find that later on in Moses life time these heads were called together for civil purposes, and also in Joshua's lifetime. The "heads" of the tribes seem to have been sent to spy out the land. Num. xiii. 3. Moses called them to take part in renewing the covenant a short time before his death. Joshua also did the same thing. We are justified therefore in saying that these heads of tribes were both civil and military leaders and rulers. Num. i. 4-16; vii. 2; x. 14-27; xvii. 6; ii. 3-29; Josh. xxiii. 2; xxiv. 1.

3. Below these heads there were in each tribe the heads of families, as in Num. Chapter i. properly called elders, who come into gerat prominence in the progress of the history. Then there were captains of thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens, as appointed at Mt. Sinai. Besides these there were Shophetim and Shoteri—"Judges and officers." The exact functions of these last, who were quite numerous, are not easily differentiated. They were scribes, registers, genealogists, roll keepers, with magisterial functions, and also legislative, as we shall see later. We may remark that we nowhere find in ancient times the sharply defined distinctions of function that prevail in our day.

4. Each city had its local self-government by a council of elders, or, as we say, a board of aldermen. They were sometimes quite numerous as in Succoth in Gideon's day. Judges viii. 6, 8, 14. "The elders of the city" are mentioned ten times in such a way that we must see that every city had a government by elders; for example, "The elders of every city," Ezra x. 14; "The elders of that city," Deut. xxi. 6; "The elders of his city," Deut. xxv. 8, etc. Local municipal governments were by a council of elders.

5. Each tribe was thus sovereign in local affairs. This is local self-government, complete and final, except as surrendered or modified when welded into the commonwealth. There are certain regalia of sovereignty, declaring and making war and peace, the making of treaties and the coinage of money later on. Some of these do not seem to have been entirely surrendered to the commonwealth.

The tribes sometimes made war and peace separately and sometimes jointly with one or more others. In the first chapter of Judges we learn that Judah, separately, and jointly with Simeon, undertook the further subjugation of the Canaanites in their respective borders. Manasseh, and Zebulum and Asher conquered Canaanites in their borders and made them tributaries. This means that they made war and peace separately. Local enemies did not need to be met and subdued by the entire commonwealth. We learn from Judges vi. 35 that Gideon caled upon Manasseh, Zebulun, Asher, and Naphtali to drive out the Midianites and their allies. Barak called Zebulun and Naphtali to war against Sisera and his hosts. Judges iv. 10. Jephthah drove back the Ammonites with the help of the tribes east of the river, under the general name Gileadites. Judges xi.

Two or more tribes jointly did other things by reason of their sovereignty. The building of the altar of Ed on the East of the river is a case in point. Joshua xxii. 10-12. Judah acting alone set a king over her, and levied war and made peace and performed all other acts of sovereignty just as if there were no other tribes. These facts are ample evidence to show that the sovereignty of the tribes was not lost in the commonwealth.

6. We may now recognize a confederate republic of sovereign states—twelve equal units—each republican in form and government. It was not a democracy on the one hand nor a centralized despotism on the other.

We have seen how patriarchal and personal rule in the family was modified into the election of rulers of all grades so that the government became representative instead of personal. This modification was made at Sinai.

We have also seen that liberty and equality was the heritage of all the people, and how it was fostered and protected from oppression by the rich and servile cringing of the poor.

We have also seen how their free institutions were protected from each and all of the seven aristocracies which have dominated other peoples and swept away their liberties.

We mention again that their institutions were secured by a written constitution which Moses wrote in a book and laid up before the Lord by the ark of the covenant for greater sanctity and for permanent preservation. The same thing was done when the kingdom was established in order that the king might rule a still free people, and might not degenerate into an autocrat or a despot. These two books, the book of the covenant and the book of the kingdom, need not be confounded with the authentic book of the law that was laid up by the ark in the most holy place. Those two written constitutions have been lost and with them many interesting details. But the sacred books that remain contain every important principle.

7. The question recurs, what was the nature of the bond that held this confederacy together? Was it an indissoluble bond? Was it criminal and treasonable to dissolve the compact when irksome to any one or more of the tribes or states? It would seem that free sovereign states would not and could not enter into a confederacy which would take away their sovereignty and transfer it to the nation. We find that this theory fits the facts of the case. The first secession took place when Judah set up for herself and made David king. They all came together again at the end of seven years on terms mutually agreeable. Judah's secession had the divine approval and was constitutional.

The next secession took place after the death of

Solomon. A brief sketch of the facts will elucidate the rights of all parties. The tribes all met through their representative electors to choose a king. Rehoboam was the presumptive king. But they first discussed the policy of the kingdom, and made an almost unanimous demand for retrenchment and reform as a platform for the new king to stand upon. Rehoboam, backed by Judah, rejected the demands of the electors. Ten tribes "bolted the convention" led by Jeroboam, a popular leader.

So two kings were elected and the secession became permanent. The Lord forbade Judah to make war upon the ten tribes to bring them back into one commonwealth. The right of secession was distinctly recognized as constitutional.

8. It has been argued that the right of secession would make a confederacy a mere rope of sand. Let us see. The Hebrew commonwealth stood for 500 years before the first secession and eighty years longer before the second. The second secession was permanent and there were two confederacies thereafter—one of two tribes and the other of ten tribes. Corruption and decay had set in, but the rivalry of the two kingdoms and their politico-religious parties retarded their more rapid downfall. It is not our purpose to trace and discuss the modifications that took place down to the captivities and after the return to Palestine.

9. There were other civil bonds that we will discuss in other chapters. These were a chief magistracy, a national assembly and a judiciary. These were Federal bonds as opposed to tribal, and constituted the Federal or national government.

10. There were also moral and ecclesiastical bonds. While their moral and ecclesiastical institutions were no

part of the civil government, their influence to bind them all together as a homogeneous people was very powerful. Such forces and their influence have been recognized in history in all ages.

These bonds were, the tabernacle, the temple later on, the ritual and ceremonial usages, and three great annual feasts, to which we may add minor fast days and festival days. The priests and Levites belonged to their ecclesiastical system. They had no local or tribal or sectional interests to interfere with their loyalty to the Federal government in which many of them were appointed as officials, as we shall see. As religious teachers and educators and as Federal officials, their influence and interests were all centered in the confederated commonwealth. This was no weak bond.

After the final division of the confederacy into two, Jeroboam found it necessary to modify the ritual, to change the place of worship and the time of the festivals, and to institute another priestly order, so as to avail himself and his kingdom of these powerful forces. This group of changes is spoken of as "The sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat." They became the fixed policy of his kingdom. But in this matter the kingdom of Judah had immensely the advantage.

11. The Theocracy served to weld all these bonds into one, for the Lord was the civil head of the commonwealth, and the ecclesiastical head of their religious system, and the author of all their institutions, and their wise and skilful administration of them.

CHAPTER XI.

THE THEOCRACY.

The Lord God, Jehovah, the Second Person of the Trinity, was the civil head of the Hebrew commonwealth. When they had come to Mt. Sinai, the Lord called Moses up into the Mount and he bade him go back to the children of Israel and make them this proposition from him: "If ye will obey my voice indeed and keep my covenant, thou shalt be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." And all the people answered together, and said, "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." "And Moses returned the word of the people unto the Lord," Ex. xix. 3-8.

In this transaction we may note several things. It was a covenant between the Lord and the house of Jacob. It was proposed by him and ratified by the unanimous vote of the people. By it they became a "kingdom of priests" unto him—they had access to him such as no other people enjoyed. It made them his peculiar treasure above all people, and gave him a different ownership, though all the earth was his.

We call this the Theocratic covenant. He was made the civil head and king of the commonwealth about to be formed out of the twelve tribes of Israel. It is significant that this covenant started from God and was ratified by the people. This insured infinite wisdom and begat universal confidence. This peculiar relation was not put upon them by authority, but was the free choice of the people by their suffrages. This free suffrage at this time was the pledge and the guaranty of free institutions throughout.

This is the covenant that was so often renewed with solemnity in the progress of their history. Passing generations sometimes forget fundamental truths and sometimes swerve and even depart from the genius and spirit of their institutions, and it becomes necessary to return to first principles.

Then again it is proper on great occasions, or epochs, or crises in the history of a people to emphasize and give great prominence to cherished principles and treasured rights. At the end of forty years of administration Moses renewed the covenant for all Israel just as at Mt. Sinai. Joshua did the same thing at the close of his administration, as we have seen already.

This covenant was evidently renewed again and again in the time of the Judges when the people repented of their waywardness and returned unto the Lord, who then delivered them out of the hands of their enemies.

This covenant had a moral and a spiritual side. The first thing after the establishment of this covenant was the proclamation of the Moral Law from Mt. Sinai, amid the most awful scenes and sanctions. It was also written on two tables of stone by God Himself and laid up in the ark of the covenant under the Mercy Seat in the Most Holy place.

While we need not confound the civil, the moral, the religious and the ecclesiastical, they were so intimately related in the life of the people that fidelity in one implied fidelity in all; and the neglect or breach of one was certain to vitiate them all to a greater or less degree.

It is not easy to count how often the Lord charged his people, from Moses to the later prophets, with breaking, violating, transgressing, not keeping or forgetting his covenant. The large part of these occurred in the declension and decay of the kingdom, and they furnished the key to much in their history.

Rebellions, chastisements, repentance and renewals of the covenant were notable in the history. But they were by no means so frequent as they might seem for we must remember that the history spans 1500 years.

One of the most notable renewals of the covenant was made by Asa and the kingdom of Judah. 2 Chron. xv. 12-15. "They entered into a covenant to seek the Lord God of their fathers with all their heart and with all their soul; that whosoever would not seek the Lord God of Israel should be put to death, whether small or great, whether man or woman. And they sware unto the Lord with a loud voice, and with shouting, and with trumpets, and with cornets. And all Judah rejoiced at the oath; for they swore with all their heart, and sought him with their whole desire; and he was found of them; and the Lord gave them rest round about."

In analyzing this passage we claim that the covenant thus renewed was the civil covenant, the Theocratic, in which they renewed their allegiance to their rightful lord and king. The oath was for civil allegiance, not a religious reconsecration. The shouting, and trumpets and cornets indicated great civil demonstrations. Death to the recusant was not religious persecution as the Papist argues, but the just and righteous punishment of treasonable practices against their lawful civil head and king. The rest he gave them was rest from their enemies round about. It is evident from the context that there was also a great religious revival and turning to the Lord who was their God as well as their king.

We may now proceed to consider a number of features of this unique and peculiar form of government which we call the Theocracy.

1. The Tabernacle was his royal pavilion for 500 years, the place where he held his court, and from which he administered his kingdom. The Tabernacle was superseded by the temple when the kingdom assumed larger prominence, and it was the palace of the Great King. The Mercy Seat was his throne, where he sat in visible presence represented by a cloud which was called the Shekinah.

In confirmation, "Aaron was forbidden to come at all times into the Holy Place, 'lest he die; for I will appear in the cloud upon the Mercy Seat." In Ps. lxxx. 1, we read: "Thou that dwellest between the cherubims, shine forth." The 24th Psalm seems to celebrate in song his triumphal entry into the temple, at its dedication; "Life up your head, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up ye everlasting doors; and the king of glory shall come in."

2. The human chief magistrate was the viceroy of the true king. The chief magistrates were for several centuries called Judges; we have already considered their call, commission and function. After them come the kings. We may understand why the chief magistrate needed the divine nomination as well as the human election; he was the viceroy of the true King, and administered the government in his name and by his authority. It were a usurpation to take this honor without a divine commission.

3. If there be a Theocracy there must be a medium of communication between the divine ruler and his repre-

sentative or viceroy. This medium was twofold, prophet and oracle. In addition to these the viceroy had for his ordinary and constant guidance the book of the law, which was God's revealed will so far as written. The king was required to make a copy of the same and "read it all the days of his life that he may do and keep the law and the statutes." Deut. xvii. 18-20.

Sometimes, however, difficult questions arose for solution, and the viceroy felt the need of divine guidance, such as war and peace. In such cases the viceroy had access either by prophet or oracle to the supreme head and ruler of the commonwealth.

Then again, it sometimes happened that the king failed of his duty from ignorance, or unbelief, or by the bad advice of his counsellors. And sometimes, by sheer perversity, or low ambitions, he engaged in dangerous or forbidden enterprises. In such cases God used prophet or oracle to reprove, rebuke, restrain or control. And sometimes special commissions were given to do certain things through the same channels.

It would be easy to make numerous citations to illustrate these things. Samuel bade Saul to exterminate the Amalekites and rebuked him from God for his failure to execute commands. The prophet Jehu's rebuke of Jeroboam is a case in hand. Elijah's dealing with Ahab in the name of his master is further illustration, and so on through the whole trend of divine administration of the Theocracy.

The prophet had two functions, one religious, the other civil. He was an inspired, religious teacher intended to supplement the possible evils of a hereditary priesthood and Levitical teacher. Their civil functions gave them authority over civil rulers with a "Thus saith the Lord." They were ministers clothed with plenary powers to advise and direct the civil rulers, and they stood ready to answer from heaven all his inquiries.

The word oracle literally signifies a divine communication. We need not here discuss the manner of it, except to say that it was gotten by the High Priest when inquiries were made of the Lord by such as were competent to do so.

The chief magistrate, be he Moses, Joshua, one of the Judges, or a king, had the exclusive use of the oracle. Num. xxvii. 18-21; Josh. i. 1-9. Moses carried all hard cases, that he could not solve in judgment, to the Lord for solution. Deut. xvii. 9-12.

4. There were two kinds of worship at the Tabernacle and then at the Temple. One was distinctly religious and spiritual in its character, and was then, is now, and always will be a personal matter. We are not concerned with this at present.

The other kind of worship was civic honor paid to their divine king. There was much of pomp and pageant connected with this civic worship. The blowing of trumpets at the new moons and on the first day of the seventh month which was the beginning of their civil year, were distinctly civic and national. Their timbrels, organs, harps, cornets, psalteries, cymbals and processions were of the same class, all of which imposed upon the senses and cultivated patriotism and loyalty with their glad acclaim.

The Papacy is consistent in adopting all these things because she claims to be a Theocracy, and the Pope is its head; and as the vice-regent of heaven he claims civic honors from all nations. But there is no place today for pomp and pageant in worship if we reject his claims.

Some of their institutions were partly civil and national and partly personal and religious. The Passover, for example; so far as it commemorated the deliverance from Egypt it was civic and national; so far as it was typical of Christ and his blood it was the personal religious worship of the believing partaker.

So also the feast of Tabernacles. So far as it commemorated the sojourn in the wilderness it was civic and Theocratic; so far as it was a season of thanksgiving and special worship it was personal and religious.

A similar distinction runs through their sacrificial offerings. The burnt offering seems to have had a civil and a national aspect. The morning and evening sacrifice was a burnt offering and seems to have been corporate and national instead of personal. All other offerings were personal, sin-offerings, trespass offerings and peace offerings. There are certain exceptions to this, rather apparent than real, and they confirm the distinction when rightly understood. A full discussion of this would lead us too far afield, but we may cite one or two illustrations.

The official sins and mistakes of the whole congregation or of a ruler required special offerings. It must have been because of their civic relations. When an individual offered burnt offerings, he also offered trespass or sin offerings. This seems to recognize the double relation of citizen and sinner before God. Then there were large special sacrificial offerings for the feasts and the new moons which were in no proper sense personal.

The question recurs, why were bloody offerings and especially burnt offerings required in civic honors paid to the great king. The reason is not given, but is not far to see. The bloody offering was for propitiation and typified Christ, and the whole burnt offering would seem to represent most fully the propitiation for sin. "Oh sinful nation," says the prophet. Now when the sinful nation sought to draw nigh to their infinitely holy king it was meet that they propitiate him lest he consume them in his wrath. This principle is true of the citizen, as such also, as well as of the nation; hence the need for his burnt offering.

5. While there was large provision made for civic honors to the Theocratic head of the commonwealth, there was no provision made for civic honors to be paid his viceroy. For five hundred years he had no retinue, state, revenues nor salary, so far as we can see from the record; but he lived as a private citizen in absolute republican simplicity.

The rules given by Moses for kings, when set up, indicate nothing more than this. But the kings soon went into the opposite extremes in imitation of kingdoms round about, and as riches increased. We need not trace here the inevitable result of all this.

6. The Theocracy was not superseded by the kingdom as has been generally held. The spirit with which they demanded a king, tended that way, but under Samuel's appeal at Gilgal the people repented of their rebellious temper, and the Lord stood in the same relation to the kingdom as before. In fact the history of the kingdom abounds in Theocratic usages by prophet and oracle. Compare 1 Samuel viii. 7, 12-25. All agree that the Theocracy existed from the captivity to Christ, but for obvious reasons we have nothing like so much evidence of it as before.

7. This was the only Theocracy ever established in the world and must not be imitated in essential and differentiating features. All unions of church and state are

bastard theoracies in which the church has sought to dominate the state, or the state has ruled the church. Jacobites, Legitimists, Papists, etc., have no grounds for their claims. Their Jewish analogies are false.

8. Was the Theocracy a union of church and state? We answer no, with some diffidence, for this has been held universally. The true view is that church and state were in equilibrio, and the Lord was the head of both. He was the civil head of the republic, and was also the head of the ecclesiastical system or hierarchy. These both had access to him by prophet and oracle, and found their only unity in him. Under his administration neither state nor church could dominate the other. Besides, the safeguards were ample. We have already discussed the safeguards against a priestly aristocracy and domination.

Two features are obvious. Neither church nor state derived its rights and franchises from the other, nor over the other. Neither could fill official positions in the other, or usurp the functions of the other. The dreadful experiences of Saul and of Uzziah are unanswerable.

The other feature is this; each had its own revenues. The state had its taxes and tribute, the church had its tithes and offerings. Each collected its own revenues and disbursed them in its own way. The author has discussed tithes somewhat fully in another place. It is sufficient to repeat here these facts. The Levitical tithe was not a tax; there were no tithe assessors; nor collectors. It was self-assessed and paid over to the religious order, the tribe of Levi, and disbursed to Levites, priests and Jehovah, the head. Civil officials had nothing to do with the revenues of the hierarchy. In later unions of church and state, tithes are taxes collected by the strong arm of the state and are disbursed by it to support the church.

9. Does this mean the absolute independence of both? Hardly. They were independent within the limits indicated. But the individual was presumably a member of both church and state. The ultimate jurisdiction of each met in him to guaranty to him his rights in each. It is obvious, therefore, that church and state had certain mutual duties and obligations. It was the duty of the state to protect and defend the church in her franchises even to the extent of religious wars. On the other hand the church was bound to uphold the righteous acts of the state with all the sanctions of morality and religion, and to reprove and rebuke, with all long suffering and patience, all departure from the divine law of right in civil administration.

CHAPTER XII.

THE SACRED ORACLE.

The discussion of the Theocracy can hardly be considered complete without some further discussion of the Oracle. The word oracle in its broadest sense may be given to any divine communication. Paul speaks of the Scriptures as "The Oracles of God" because they contain such a summary of divine revelations as was transmitted to succeeding ages. Rom. iii. 2.

Revelations were sometimes given in dreams as in the case of Joseph. His dreams carried their own interpretations with them to the surprise of his father and mother and the bitter hatred of his brethren. Gen. xxxvii. 5-11. Pharoah's dreams and the dreams of his baker and butler needed an inspired interpreter. Gen. Chapters xl. and xli. So also with Nebuchadnezzar's two famous dreams. Dan. Chapters ii. and iv. Joseph and the wise men of the East were divinely directed in dreams. Matt. Chapter ii. We do not know just how dreams for revelation differed from ordinary dreams, but the dreamers seem to have understood it, and the results verified the dreams.

Revelations were sometimes given in visions and ecstasies. The Abrahamic covenant was made and ratified in vision. Gen. xv. We may cite Jacob's vision at Bethel and at Beersheba; also Daniel's prophetic visions at Shushan and by the river Chebar. Ezekiel's visions in Babylon and John's visions on Patmos occupy a large place in the Oracles of God.

Sometimes the oracles came *viva voce* and face to face. When Jesus was baptized "there came a voice from heaven saying, This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased." Matt. iii. 17. The same testimony was given the same way again and again. God said of Moses, "With him will I speak mouth to mouth." Num. xii. 8.

However, the limited and technical oracle was a divine message or communication at the temple or at the Tabernacle. The most holy place, or the Holy of Holies, the inner room, within the vail, was also called the Oracle, because that was the shrine from which oracles came. 1 Kings vi. 19-20; Ps. xxviii. 2. Within it were the Ark and the Mercy Seat under the cherubim and the Shekinah, the visible presence of the Lord himself.

When Moses set up the Ark and the Mercy Seat in the finished Tabernacle, the Lord said to him, "There will I meet thee and I will commune with thee from above the Mercy Seat from between the cherubims which are upon the Ark of the Testimony, in all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel. Ex. xxv. 22.

In Num. vii. 89 we are told that Moses "heard the voice of one speaking unto him from off the Mercy Seat that was upon the Ark of Testimony, from between the Cherubims." We are told in another place that the Lord spake with him face to face, only with the veil or curtain intervening, "as a man speaketh to his friend," Ex. xxxiii. 11; and Joshua seems to have heard it.

After the time of Moses, beginning with Joshua, the oracle was obtained through the high priest in an audible tone of voice coming from within the vail and from off the Mercy Seat. Moses gave the directions at the inauguration of Joshua as joint ruler and leader with him and then his successor. He should stand with Eleazar, the high priest, who should make his quest for him. This double presence made priestly trickery impossible. Num. xxvii. 21. The voice sometimes came without the intervention of the high priest, as when the Lord called Samuel three times and gave him that solemn warning and rebuke for Eli, 1 Sam. iii. 1-18.

In all such cases the high priest must be clad in his official robes, including the Ephod and the breast plate in which was the Urim and Thummim, or the Urim, dropping the second word. Sometimes the Ephod only is named as the necessary vestment in such cases, because the Ephod included the breast plate and its setting and was not complete without it. Therefore these several terms mean the same thing, "By Urim," and "by Urim and Thummim," and "with the Ephod."

The oracle might be consulted at any time whenever God's guidance and advice were needed. David consulted the oracle often for divine direction when pursued and persecuted by Saul. 1 Sam. xxiii. 9, 10; xxx. 7-8. There were apparent irregularities connected with David's use of the oracle at this period. We may examine them.

No one but the king or viceroy had access to the oracle. But David was not yet king; Saul was still king. Then again, David made inquiries far away from the tabernacle, where the oracle was usually given. The history of the case furnishes the solution.

When David fled from Saul's jealousy he went to Nob, a suburb of Gibeon, where the Tabernacle was, and Ahimelech gave him the shew bread and the sword of Goliath, which trophy he had himself laid up in the Tabernacle. Doeg the Edomite reported the matter to Saul with the superadded slander that Ahimelech, the high priest, had inquiried of the Lord for David who was not entitled to the oracle. Saul alone as king was entitled to it. The high priest would not have been able to use it amiss, had he tried, for he Lord only could utter the oracle. But the effort to use it for David would have been treason to Saul. Saul called him to account, but he denied the charge and asserted David's conspicuous loyalty to the king and his own, and especially denied the charge of consulting the oracle. But Saul believed Doeg and bade him wreak vengeance on the priests and on the city of Nob. He slew the high priest and eighty-five priests and gave over the entire city to rapine, pillage, and slaughter of old and young, male and female.

So he forfeited finally his right to reign and from that time he was deserted of the Lord and had neither vision, prophet nor oracle, but consulted the witch of Endor when reduced to the direst straits.

Abiathar, however, the son and lawful successor of Ahimelech, escaped the slaughter and went to David carrying with him the vestments of the high priest. From that time on the Lord communicated with David who was already the divinely appointed successor of Saul.

It is true that the ark of the covenant was not in David's camp and the oracle would seem to be, to that extent, irregular. But we must remember that the ark was not at Nob in the Tabernacle at that time, but at the house of Obed Edom, where it stopped on the way back from the Philistines who had captured it in Eli's day.

From all this we learn that irregularities did not interrupt or vitiate the oracle, but it was in some mysterious way connected with the priestly vestments, especially the breast plate. But after the captivity the ark, the Mercy Seat, the priestly vestments and the breast plate and other articles of the temple furniture were never restored, but the high priest retained the oracle or the spirit of prophecy down to the end of the Theocracy when Caiaphas uttered his famous prophecy by virtue of his office, "Being high priest that year."

From all this we conclude that, in the last analysis, the oracle belonged to the high priest by virtue of his office irrespective of varying conditions.

We also get this wider lesson in government, civil and religious; there may be a wide variety of forms and conditions without destroying the substance. This, however, is not true where the form embodies a principle.

A word more about the Urim and Thummim. Many views have been advanced to explain these terms and to identify them in the breast-plate. The simplest identification would seem to be this. The terms have been translated "Lights and Perfections." Now the breast-plate was made of white linen folded to give it some stiffness. Twelve different precious stones of great value, with the names of the twelve tribes of Israel engraved upon them, on each stone a tribe, were set in pure gold and arranged in four rows on the breast-plate. It had rings on four corners and chains of gold by which it was fastened by taches or hooks of gold on the Ephod.

We may easily imagine the radiance of these stones of varied colors flashing and scintillating in the sunlight, or the lamplight, as they trembled on the moving and heaving breast of the high priest. This magnificent symbolism would seem to be aptly named, "Lights and Perfections." The lights would seem to symbolize the divine intelligence and the precious stones his supreme excellence. Could the oracle need any better symbolism? The simplest explanation would seem to be the best.

This oracle was the nexus of the human and the divine in a Theocratic civil government. Perhaps we may not be able to say that the oracle was entirely a civil and judicial institution; for we find cases where it was used for purposes purely religious, ecclesiastical and prophetical.

The Lord sat on the Mercy Seat between the cherubims for another purpose besides giving the oracle. He was also the head of the religious and ecclesiastical system. The priest was the mediator, typical of Christ, and he made intercession for the people he represented. He made all the sacrificial offerings for propitiation; he burned incense morning and evening, typical of prayer and intercession; and once a year on the Great Day of Atonement he entered within the vail with blood and the burning of incense, first for his own sins and then for the people; and the Lord was present to hear and forgive. This doubtless gave the name Mercy Seat. But no oracle seems to have been uttered in response to these intercessions.

Paganism has had its shrines, its penetralia and its oracles. In 2 Kings i. 1-16 we are told that Ahaziah, having been seriously hurt by a fall through the lattice, sent messengers to Beelzebub, the god of Ekron, to enquire of that oracle what would be the issue of the sickness into which he had fallen.

The oracle at Delphi had world-wide fame, where the priests of Apollo, for large rewards, foretold the destinies of kings and peoples. By jugglery and by trickery, and by ambiguous oracles they long maintained their ascendency over Grecian and Asiastic peoples. We may quote two of their ambiguous oracles which history has handed down to us. "*Croesus transgressus Halym maxima* *regna perdet,"* and this *"Aio, te, Aeacide, Romanos vincere posse."*

There is a small party of theorists in the United States, to which a number of prominent names belong, who wish to convert our government into a Theocracy. They claim that governments are either Pagan or Christian, and that ours is Pagan in that it does not recognize God and Christ in the Constitution. Amendments are frequently proposed and argued in Congress to recognize the Trinity as the real head of our commonwealth and the Bible as our supreme law book.

They argue that Christianity should be declared the common law as has been done in England when upholding Sabbath laws and the like. They argue that such civil and social evils as general Sabbath breaking, easy divorce, the social evil, the saloon power and Mormonism could have found no place in such a Theocracy, but are the natural fruits of Paganism. They also argue that such a government would have minimized the development of such false substitutes for Christianity as Unitarianism and Universalism, and would have been a substantial check to the power of the Romish Hierarchy.

The twin sister of this theory of government is this, "Civic Christianity," and its bantling, "Institutional Church," and it is growing rapidly. Its fundamental proposition is this; that the state only can be relied on to reform and foster social and public morality and that no great evil can be corrected or even restrained by the mere sanctions of religion. Sooner or later the two theories indicated must coalesce into one, for they aim at substantially the same thing.

We have quoted these two theories for information in this connection, and not for confutation, except to say that the proposed Theocracy lacks the one differentiating element of a real Theocracy, to-wit: Inter-communication between God and the civil government so as to settle all difficult matters at a divine tribunal.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE JUDICIARY.

In a patriarchal system all the functions of government were lodged in the patriarchs or heads of families who were absolute rulers except as they were controlled by precedents, customs and unwritten law. Their authority was upheld by loyal support, and reinforced by family ties, and justified by the large experience and wisdom of the elders in family council. Division and distribution of the several governmental functions sprung up at a later period as tribes grew into nations and peoples, and as governments became of necessity more complex.

When Jacob and his sons went down to Egypt they were divided into twelve families according to his sons, and each son became the patriarchal ruler of his family. They all together were at the first only seventy males, or less. During their sojourn in Egypt 215 years, they increased by natural generation, and by assimilation of several thousand slaves until they numbered at least two millions.

The families grew into tribes, in each of which the chief patriarch became the recognized head. Each tribe was divided meanwhile into its leading families governed by the patriarchal heads thereof. There were fifty-eight heads of these families exercising patriarchal jurisdiction. Add the twelve heads of the tribes to these fifty-eight heads of families and we have the seventy elders who came out of Egypt and their names or their successors are recorded in Num. Chapters i. and xxvi.

We may easily see how each tribe became an inchoate government with its head or prince, and its patriarchal or family elders. These twelve princes or heads of tribes and fifty-eight heads of families in aggregated council became an inchoate commonwealth. They are spoken of as the seventy elders, known and recognized as such. Num. xi. 16.

This gives us the key to their condition in Egypt. They were an agglommeration of families with local self-government, subject, however, to a supreme allegiance to the government of Egypt for offense and defense, and subject to such tribute of service or of the products of the soil as might be laid upon them.

The oppressions of the Hebrews were largely tribute, levied in the form of drafted service on the great public works of the kingdom. In all this the Hebrews were no exception. All the great kingdoms of ancient times were aggregations of similar families rendering similar service in war, and similar labors and tribute in peace.

It is easy to see how government grew up in the family, and also how nations and peoples were divided acording to their families as we see in the tenth chapter of Genesis. Thus local self-government dates back to the beginning, and the next unfolding was of confederated families into a tribe, and the next was of confederate tribes into a commonwealth. All of this must have originated with the author of the family, either by direct revelation or providential control, which we call natural law. This theory is historically true and has been more or less obvious in all ages. The great empires of antiquity were great aggregations of tribes, peoples and nations, consolidated by the sword with martial law as the main cohesive principle. In the army of Xerxes, when he invaded Greece, we are told that 220 languages were spoken by troops from as many peoples. No wonder such empires disintegrated rapidly in the face of military disaster; and racial and local self-government reasserting themselves with unerring certainty.

When Moses had received his commission to deliver his people from Egypt he called together the elders of his people by divine command, and explained his commission, and they believed and united with him in demanding of Pharaoh a release from the land. These were the seventy elders, so constantly recognized afterward. The Hebrews in Egypt were in a state of flux and transition from the family to a great civil commonwealth, and the functions of these elders were in a corresponding state of transition. We have but little data by which we may trace these changes while in Egypt. But we have an ample account of the later changes from the patriarchal and the tribal to the national. We need only to analyze Sinaitic legislation.

We have done much of this already in former chapters. Our object here is to study the origin, nature and form of their divinely ordered judiciary system, as distinguished from other functions of complex government.

We have no means of knowing how far the Hebrews in Egypt were subject to an Egyptian judiciary. During the period of the bondage and oppression they must have been largely subject to Egyptian courts. This would seem necessary in order to carry out the policy of the government in dealing with them. And in this respect they were, no doubt, largely deprived of local self-government. The form remained for future use, but the substance was taken away.

However this may be, their judiciary system was wholly inadequate when they reached Mt. Sinai. The whole brunt of it fell upon Moses and he was greatly overburdened with it, as we learn from Exodus xviii. 13-18.

Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, himself a priest, a prophet, and a prince among his people, called Moses' attention to the difficulties of the situation, verse 18, "Thou wilt surely wear away, both thou and the people that is with thee; for this thing is too heavy for thee; thou art not able to perform it thyself alone."

He then suggested to Moses a remedy, verse 19, "Hearken now unto my voice; I will give thee counsel, and God shall be with thee." Moses hearkened unto Jethro's words and received them as from God, with the divine approval. A system of graded courts was recommended and established and Moses was relieved of the burden. Verses 20-26.

We may quote the entire passage. "Be thou for the people to Godward, that thou mayst bring the causes unto God: and thou shalt teach them ordinances and laws, and shalt shew them the way wherein they must walk, and the work that they must do. Moreover, thou must provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness, and place such over them, to be rulers of thousands, and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens; and let them judge the people at all seasons; and it shall be that every great matter they shall bring unto thee, but every small matter they shall judge; so shall it be easier for thyself, and they shall bear the burden with thee. If thou shalt do this thing, and God command thee so, then thou shalt be able to endure, and all this people shall also go to their place in peace. So Moses hearkened to the voice of his father-in-law, and did all that he said. And

Moses chose able men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens; and they judged the people at all seasons: the hard causes they brought unto Moses, and every small matter they judged themselves."

We find another account of this transaction given by Moses forty years afterwards in his first address of several, uttered a short time before his death, and recorded in Deut. i. 9-18. In it we find variations and additions which we shall note, but no contradictions. We need not quote the whole. The two accounts, however make a complete whole, as in many other places in the Scriptures, where there are two or more accounts of the same thing. For illustration, we may cite The Harmony of the four Gospels.

A careful analysis of this new judiciary system reveals several points worthy of note.

1. These organizations of tens, fifties, etc., were based on the census of males which had been made, six hundred thousand men of military age, capable of having arms. Ten of these in a class included also in the same class their immediate families, wives children and slaves, and also their aged and infirm, for these all had rights under law which were safeguarded by judicial procedure. The subsequent history makes this evident. The class therefore must have often included forty or fifty persons under the judicial jurisdiction of its head.

2. The class of fifty was a higher jurisdiction over five classes of ten, and included from 200 to 250 persons. And so on to the classes of hundreds and thousands.

3. The heads of these several classes were judges who tried causes of all kinds, civil and criminal, accord-

ing to law and equity. This is a distinct and final advance beyond a patriarchal jurisdiction. We find here a clear definition of the judiciary as distinguished from the legislative and the executive.

4. We have noted in another place that these judges were elected under Moses' direction, Deut. i. 9, 13 and 14. "I spoke to you at that time, saying, I am not able to bear you myself alone." "Take you wise men and men of understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you, and ye answered me and said, The thing which thou hast spoken is good for us to do." They were elected by the people and inducted into office by Moses. It is said in Exodus that Moses "chose able men, etc." This does not contradict Moses' account as given in Deuteronomy. He only caused them to be chosen. We constantly say that a man did so and so when he caused it to be done. *Qui facit per alium facit per se.*

5. Moses' charge, when he inducted them into office, is a sufficient definition of their duties. Deut. i. 16, 17. "I charged your judges at that time, saying, Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment; but ye shall hear the small as well as the great; ye shall not be afraid of the face of man; for the judgment is God's."

Both law and equity were the foundation of the judgment seat. Ex. xviii. 16. "I do make them to know the statues of God and his laws." Verse 20. "Thou shalt teach them ordinances and laws."

6. No wonder the character of the men to be chosen was so guarded in the warrant—"able men, such as fear

God, men of truth, hating covetousness." "Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes." Ermined robes to this day are intended to indicate a spotless judiciary.

7. We may safely infer that this was a system of graded courts, though there is no categorical statement to that effect. We may also infer that the higher courts had appellate jurisdiction. The jurisdiction of the lower courts is distinctly limited to minor matters, great matters and difficult were referred to a higher tribunal. Moses was at the apex of the system as God's representative and viceroy. For the final appeal in all difficult cases was to the theocratic head, Ex. xviii. 22. "Every great matter they shall bring unto thee, but every small matter they shall judge. Deut. i. 17, "The cause that is too hard for you bring it unto me." Ex. xviii. 19. "Be thou to the people to Godward that thou mayst bring the causes unto God."

Out of all this we get the principle of limited courts and courts of larger powers and appellate jurisdiction, till the court of final appeal is reached. These principles are of divine origin and application and essential to good government though the details of administration may vary.

8. After Moses, who was lawgiver, law expounder and supreme judge—yet not Moses, but Jehovah, the head of the commonwealth—Joshua and then the viceroy, be he judge or king, were at the apex of this judiciary through the high priest and the oracle.

9. These judges were limited to their respective lists and these lists were evidently sections of the census or enrollment which was made according to families. We may therefore fairly conclude that this was a tribal ju-

diciary or, as we say, a "state judiciary" as distinguished from a "Federal judiciary."

We maintained in a former discussion that the Hebrew commonwealth was a confederated republic of sovereign states We are therefore not surprised to find in each of the twelve tribes or states this complex, complete and highly organized judiciary. Was there not also a need for a Federal judiciary which should conserve and defend the rights of all parties in the commonwealth? Federal courts would seem to be necessary to regulate interstate matters and to judge of all infractions of Federal legislation, and to safeguard the relations of the citizen to his state on the one hand, and to the Federal government on the other. Where shall we find evidence of such a judiciary?

We freely confess that we do not find full details of a well organized Federal judiciary. Yet we find evident traces of it in many places. During the period of the Judges we find mere hints of many things. These judges who often served long terms were certainly Federal judges, for they "judged Israel," some twenty and some forty years. We are told nothing of the times and places and organization of their courts, nor what deputies or associates they may have had till we come to Samuel. We are told that he judged Israel all the days of his life, and he went from year to year to Bethel, and Gilgal, and Mizpah, and his return was to Ramah; and when he was old he made his two sons his deputies. These things indicate a systematic administration of justice which was above the tribal judiciary.

The priests sat as judges to decide on the social and civil rights of the clean and the unclean and the leprous and all questions of quarantine. They also sat in judgment upon matters of jealousy in the marriage relation with extraordinary powers. All of which we find in Levit. xiii, and Num. v. These judicial functions were exercised for the whole people and were Federal rather than tribal.

When David expanded and more fully organized all departments of the government, both the civil and the ecclesiastical, he distributed the Levites to many lines of service, and he made six thousand of them officers and judges, 1 Chron. xxiii. 4. These distributions were hardly novelties and innovations, but were a more complete organization and assignment of duties.

The Levites had no tribal allegiance and they had a minimum of civil rights. They were the servants of the entire people. They were the literary class and made scribes and lawyers, and were the best expounders of the law. They were supported by the tithes of the people and had ample leisure for such service.

This Levitical judiciary was therefore non-sectional and non-partisan. Sectionalism and partisanship have been the curse and blight of free institutions. The Levites in the performance of Federal duties were reinforced by their religions, moral and ecclesiastical relations. It was easier for them to hold a just balance than if the Federal judges had been taken from the several tribes with their local and civil ambitions.

This Federal judiciary all met in the high priest as the supreme judge. The civil and ecclesiastical met in him because he had the oracle and had, in easy reach, divine guidance. He was a civil functionary only to this extent. The high priest and the oracle were only ancilliary to the king who had judicial functions similar to those of Moses. We find Solomon and David sitting in judgment and pronouncing sentence under the guidance of divine wisdom, gotten by prophet and oracle.

It is likely that the Federal sometimes encroached upon the tribal in the time of the kingdom. It is strange that the balance of sound principles was maintained so long when we consider the imperfection of human administration.

Heathen peoples in the East were not strangers to the doctrine of a God-fearing judiciary. Whether they got this notion from tradition, or from contact with the Jewish Scriptures and with the dispersed Jewish people, or whether they argued it out from natural conscience and the nature of things, matters little in this connection. Artaxerxes the noted and powerful king of Persia, when he followed up the policy of Cyrus in restoring the Jewish state, temple and polity, sent Ezra to Palestine to take charge of the work and clothed him with extraordinary powers. And he gave him this charge, "And thou, Ezra, after the wisdom of thy God, that is in thine hand, set magistrates and judges, which may judge all the people beyond the river, all such as know the laws of thy God; and teach thou them that know them not. And whosoever will not do the law of thy God and the law of the king, let judgment be executed upon him, whether it be unto death, or to banishment, or to confiscation of goods or to imprisonment." Ezra vii. 25, 26.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE SENATE AND THE CONGREGATION.

We have already seen that each tribe had local self-government, and also each city inside the several tribes. These tribal governments were in the hands of elders. These constituted an independent tribal Legislature with the phylarch or head of the tribe. We have abundant hints of this 2 Sam. ii. 1-4. And each city had its board of aldermen. We are not informed of the details of the organization of these local and tribal Legislatures, whether they consisted of one or two houses; nor do we know the distribution of functions. We do find, however, the arms of all good government—the legislative, the executive and the judiciary. Besides the heads and the elders we have abundant mention of "officers" and "judges"—Shoteri and Shophetim. These were officials found numerously in each tribe as we saw in the last chapter concerning the judges. The officers (Shoteri) seem to have been scribes, roll keepers, genealogists with other functions of an executive character.

The presumption, however, is that these officers and judges were members of local Legislatures after the analogy of the Federal Congregation.

It is our purpose in this chapter to discuss their national assembly which was their legislative body. The national assembly, the Federal judiciary and the king or other supreme viceroy constituted the three branches of their Federal government. Two of these have already been considered. We now propose to show that their

Legislature consisted of two houses, the Senate and the Congregation.

Moses found seventy elders in Egypt, a patriarchal Senate and he laid before them his commission to deliver Israel from oppression and bondage and to lead them to the land that had been promised to Abraham and his seed. His contract was made with them as representatives of the entire people. They are frequently spoken of in Moses' lifetime as the "Seventy Elders," known and approved to be such.

They consisted of the twelve Phylarchs or heads of the tribes and fifty-eight heads of families as has been already set forth in a previous chapter. Their names are found in Num. i. 4-16, and in Chapter xxvi.

They were recognized at Mt. Sinai and their powers were increased. Num. xi. 16-17, "And the Lord said to Moses, Gather to me seventy men of the elders of Israel whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people and bring them unto the tabernacle of the congregation that they may stand there with thee. And I will come down and talk with thee there; and I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and I will put it upon them, and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee that thou wilt not bear it thyself alone." All this was done, as we see from verses 24 and 25. Moses had inspiration and the spirit of prophecy for the ordering and the administration of the government and they received the same. Verses 26 to 29.

They were specially honored at Mt. Sinai. The Theocratic covenant was ratified by them, and they were called up into the mountain unto the Lord along with Moses and Aaron and his sons and Joshua. They were permitted to see God in his glory. Moses bade them tarry there while he passed into the cloud which covered the mountain top and was there for forty days. "And the sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel. Ex. Chapter xxiv.

The "Congregation" seems to have been a much more popular body of several hundreds. This body seems also to have come out of Egypt for we read of the Tabernacle of the Congregation and its uses at Mount Sinai before "The Tabernacle" was made according to the pattern showed to Moses on the mount. See Exodus xxxiii. 7-11. This tabernacle has been overlooked by commentators. We find it in use immediately after Aaron set up the golden calf during the absence of Moses in the Mount. This was probably the best part of a year before the second tabernacle was built. This was the meeting place of the Congregation or Assembly.

"All Israel" in the month of Moses and of Joshua consisted of four elements, "heads," "elders," "officers" (Shoteri), and "judges" (Shophetim), and was in no sense a mass meeting as some suppose. Two millions of people, or even six hundred thousand, would have been an unweildly and impracticable democratic mass meeting for governmental purposes. Theirs was a representative government and not a pure democracy as we have shown elsewhere.

"All Israel" was present representatively when these four elements were called together. This was their national assembly. "We the people of the United States in Congress assembled" is a familiar sentence in our history—assembled representatively. See Deut. xxix. 10; Josh. xxiii. 2; xxiv. 1.

The word assembly is used several times in the place of congregation by the translators of the Scriptures. They are interchangeable terms, just as we say Congress, General Assembly, Parliament, Diet, etc. Such an assembly consists of two houses in our day—one, a more select and aristocratic body, and the other, a more popular body. We need not here argue the obvious advantages of such a system.

So here, the "heads" and the "elders" were the highest functionaries in the government, and they constituted the Senate or "upper house." The "officers" and the "judges" constituted the "lower house," the Congregation, as distinguished from the "Seventy." These two elements, "officers" and "judges" were tribal functionaries and much nearer the people in the exercise of their functions.

The Congregation was much more numerous than the Senate, as we learn from Num. xvi. 2-24, 41-46. It seems that "two hundred and fifty princes of the assembly, famous in the Congregation, men of renown," joined in the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. Said they, "ye take too much upon yourselves (Moses and Aaron), seeing all the Congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them; wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the Congregation of the Lord."

We cannot now discuss the significance of this gigantic struggle for three days between Moses and Aaron and the Lord one one side, and the Congregation on the other. There is no evidence that the Senate took any part in it. The 250 princes of the Congregation perished. These must have been less than half of that body. "On the morrow all the Congregation of the children of Israel murmured against Moses and against Aaron, saying, ye have killed the people of the Lord." We may fairly conclude that this lower house consisted of five or six hundred, or even more.

These two houses constituted a national assembly or congress. When Moses and Joshua called for "All Israel" they evidently called for both houses, the Senate including the "heads" and "elders," and the Congregation, composed of "officers" and "judges."

We find also this unique feature in the personnel of the two bodies. They were all officials in the tribal or "state" governments," as we have shown in a previous chapter. So then, the Federal Congress consisted of tribal rulers in aggregated council. This principle has not been uncommon in ancient confederations and also in feudal times.

The modern theory is the absolute separateness and independence of state and Federal authority. Which is the better theory? The presumption is certainly in favor of the Hebrew system which was a divine origin. This presumption extends to many other things as well. It would be easy to see decided advantages in Moses' plan which put the Federal government into the hands of tribal rulers in aggregated counsel. But it is not our purpose now to justify and defend these institutions, but only to analyze and define them. If we shall discover them, candid minds will give them the right of way against all comers. This statement, however, is subject to this question, How far Jewish institutions are binding or imitable? We shall endeavor to answer this question in another chapter.

The Senate sometimes met and acted separately from the Congregation. Moses and Joshua sometimes acted "By and with the advice and consent of the Senate," as we say. Treaty making seems to have been lodged with them as in the treaty with Gibeon even though the Congregation opposed it. The Senate figures largely in negotiations in later times.

The Senate also sat co-ordinately with the Congregation, and it would seem that they sometimes sat jointly with them. In fact the two houses were so intimately related that the one name often seemed to embrace both, just as in our use of the name Congress to include the two houses.

Their place of meeting was at the Tabernacle. The outer room was named the "Tabernacle of the Congregation"—the Senate probably in the Tabernacle, and the Congregation in the court or enclosure. They met "before the Lord" and were entitled to the oracle for guidance in counsel, if needed. Levit. viii. 3-4, Num. xiv. 1-10.

As a Federal Congress they made compacts. "All the people" at Mt. Sinai, through their representatives, contracted with Moses and Aaron and with the Lord, and said, "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." Ex. xix. 7-8. In their treaty with the Gibeonites the two houses were divided in opinion, but the Senate carried their point because of their right to exercise the treaty making power. In Josh ix. 15-18, we see also that the Senate modified that treaty for good reasons and with the full consent of the Gibeonites.

They interpreted laws and provided for new and exceptional cases by new legislation, and where the questions were difficult they appealed to the Lord. We find certain questions of inheritance settled in this way, Num. xxvii. 1-11. And in Num. xxxvi. 1-12 we find the property rights defined in the case of intermarriages between the tribes. Both these cases presented difficulties they could not solve unaided and they appealed to the oracle.

The membership of the Congregation was guarded in several directions. Citizenship does not carry with it the right to hold office, as clearly appears from Deut. xxiii. 1-8, to-wit:

1. Certain physical blemishes made a man ineligible to a seat in the Congregation. This put a premium on manhood.

2. A bastard and his posterity were debarred to the tenth generation. This put honor on family and social purity.

3. Ammonites and Moabites and their posterity, were debarred to the tenth generation because of their hostility in the days of Moses and Balaam and the Midianites.

4. Edomites were debarred only to the third generation because "Edom is thy brother."

5. An Egyptian was debarred only to the third generation "because thou wast a stranger in the land."

In several of these there are race distinctions which have been so much denounced in these last days. They were not debarred from citizenship in church or state, but only from the right to bear rule as representatives of the people.

Much confusion has arisen from confounding the "Congregation with the church, the synagogue and a mass meeting. It is used a few times to signify the entire people, but we can easily discover such usage from the context; e. g., Num. xxvi. 2, where we find a military census ordered, and not an assembly.

CHAPTER XV.

HEBREW CODES.

Law is a comprehensive term. It defines man's rights and duties, whether toward God or man or self. It is enacted by competent authority, and recognized authority. It is enforced by a variety of sanctions. So-called unwritten law is custom recognized as having the authority of law. Some laws are permissive, some are requirable, and some are prohibitory. Some set up and define permanent institutions such as we have been discussing, and some are intended to regulate personal conduct. None of these distinctions, however, suggest satisfactory lines of cleavage for scientific classification.

A code is an "orderly collection, system or digest of laws." It is scientific in so far as it is systematic and based on accurate analysis. We speak of the Ten Commandments as the moral code. We speak of the Theodocian Code and the Justinian Code which were collected and promulgated by their authors. We do not speak of the Mosaic Code because the laws promulgated by Moses are not presented in systematic form. We speak of a Criminal Code because it includes a certain class of laws.

The laws of Moses as found in the Pentateuch and as modified by later competent legislation are a composite whole. They embrace social, civil, moral, ceremonial, religious, criminal and institutional laws as a concrete unit with slight trace of logical order or coherency. Modern critics profess to discover various and sundry codes—"the Priestly Code," "the Deuteronomic Code," "Levitical Codes," and others—which were promulgated as the centuries passed, and bunglingly combined with a small modicum of Mosaic laws, by unknown redactors.

It would be easy to understand how such codes, if ever discovered, might have been constructed out of Mosaic legislation by analysis, and by a more systematic arrangement. But it is hard to discover on what principle such codes, if promulgated, were combined by those redactors into their present form.

It may not be out of place here to re-emphasize the fundamental principles with which we set out in this discussion. Moses was not the lawgiver, nor the author of the institutions named for him, nor was any law based on his authority; but it all originated with God himself in the person of the Son, the Theocratic head of the commonwealth. It was all as righteous, just and holy as the author himself. The nineteenth Psalm is most positive on this point; "The law of the Lord is perfect, etc." The 119th Psalm re-inforces this doctrine in every possible form of statement throughout the 176 verses. Paul says, "The law is holy and the commandment holy, just and good." Rom. vii. 12.

How then do modern condescending critics say that these institutions and laws were relatively perfect—better than surrounding Pagan institutions, and therefore worthy of all pride and praise? They say that they are the best that could be done in that semi-barbaric age, but are far short of the standards of the present day. *Per contra,* we hold that all that is good in present standards originated from the Scriptures, and is good only as far as it conforms to them. The divine lawgiver made no compromises with evil.

While this is our attitude in all these discussions, we enter upon no wholesale defence of Mosaic institutions except to brush away misconceptions and misrepresentations. The best vindication of them is careful analysis and accurate definition, just as in other fields of truth. It often happens that error in doctrine or practice is best refuted by stating the truth in contrast. We have already discussed the leading institutions in this way. We come in this chapter to analyze and classify their laws as distinguished from their institutions.

It may not be out of place here to inquire why such a variety of laws are so intermingled in the record without any apparent law of classification. One would say it was due to Eastern modes of thought which still deals with the concrete rather than the abstract. Another might say that the social, the civil, the ceremonial and the religious are so intertwined and overlapping that none of the groupings are really illogical. Both these answers are no doubt true. Besides, some of the groupings evidently grew out of environment and historic conditions. These speculations are, however, immaterial.

It would be easy by analysis of Mosaic laws to construct several codes or systematic groups of laws more or less extensive according to the principles of classification which may be adopted.

I. We might easily construct a Levitical code. We might subdivide this into a Ceremonial and a Priestly code. We pass over these codes because they do not come within the purview of this discussion.

II. We can easily construct an Ethical code in the same way, starting with the Decalogue. But we pass over this also for the same reason, except as so many social and civil laws are based on moral distinctions. Indeed it is said of them all that they are holy, just and good.

III. It would not be difficult to construct a social code out of abundant material outside the family which we have already discussed. The fundamental idea of such a code would be the second table of the law which is summed up in the words, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." All of the provisions of such a code would come under one or more of the six commandments of the second table, so far as they are based on moral distinctions. They are re-inforced to us by the prophets and then by Christ in the Sermon on the Mount and everywhere in his teachings and example.

Some of the features of such a code are unique and call for mention and explanation.

1. The doctrine of personal ownership. We find ownership of the slave, of the wife and of the children. We have reserved the first of these, slavery as an institution, for discussion in a succeeding chapter. We now note the ownership of the wife. This doctrine is definitely taught in the tenth commandment, Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's." Ownership of the wife is recognized as on the same footing as the house, the slave, the ox, the ass and any other possession. No ownership is absolute, but every ownership is limited and safeguarded by the divine law, *secundum opus,* or according to the necessary nature of things. For example, the proper treatment of the slave is protected by careful legislation. Even the ox has his rights, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn." So with the wife also.

Recent writers on social and family ties tell us that the rapid increase of divorce and the rapid decay of family ties is a just and righteous protest and rebellion against this doctrine of ownership which, they say, is a relic of barbarism. They say that this disintegration will go on, and ought to go on, till the family shall be reconstructed on the principles of the absolute liberty and equality of every person, male and female, and until the same rights, franchises and powers are secured to all in every relation of life. Which is right, the lawgiver on Mt. Sinai or the modern social reformer?

Ownership is a divine prerogative, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein." Ps. xxiv. 1: "Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price." When God made man and gave him institutions and laws he gave him this prerogative with its proper limitations. It is easy to see that it is the starting point of good government when tempered with affection, as required by the second table of the law—the law of love.

These same reformers invert the true relations of children to their parents under the pretense of exalting parental responsibility. They forget that when the so-called reformer weakens and breaks the ties that bind the father and mother the children suffer for the lack of all that they ought to get in the home—a father's control and a mother's devotion.

2. The provision for the poor was unique. We may cite the rules for gleaning fields, vineyards and orchards; the tithe every third year, self assessed and laid up at home for distribution; the permission to gather all that grew every seventh year when the land rested from tillage, and other things. Under a system like this there could be no submerged tenth and but little pauperism if any.

There was nothing like this in paganism. Modern

Christian civilization abounds in great organized charities, some supported by state and some by private contributions. But poor laws by the state are confessedly a failure, fostering and developing more poverty than they relieve. The managers of great private charities are at their wits' end to distinguish between the worthy and the unworthy poor and how to deal with them both. Who will deal with the poverty of the slums and how? Who will solve the problem of the tramp and the professional beggar in Christendom, and how? It is not our purpose here to show that these problems are the natural product of false vicious principles interwoven into our civilization.

3. Their treatment of personal enemies and the forgiveness of injuries. We are familiar with the words of Christ such as these: "Bless them that persecute you and pray for them that despitefully use you;" or of Paul: "If thine enemy hunger feed him, or if he thirst give him drink;" "Be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another." Many imagine these to be doctrines peculiar of the New Testament and contrary to the genius and spirit of the Old Testament. But Paul quotes from Proverbs xxv. 21, 22. Christ expounds and reiterates the laws touching this matter given at Sinai. Ex. xxiii. 4-5. David illustrated it in his dealings with Saul.

4. Social purity. If we could find any compromise with evil because of a supposed necessity growing out of barbaric conditions and pagan surroundings, it surely would be found here. Lust was deified and fornication was made a leading part of the worship of pagans around. It made sad inroads into the religious festivities of the Hebrews in the days of Moses and

the Moabites, in the days of Ahab and Jezebel, and at other times, but there was no compromise with it. The law rung as clear as the gospel in its call for personal purity. The criminal aspect of violations of this ethical code will be considered later.

5. Under this Ethical code we may fairly classify certain prohibitions of adulteration which have been much misunderstood and even ridiculed as "based on no sufficient reason." "Ye shall keep my statutes. Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind; thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled seed; neither shall a garment mingled of linen and woolen come upon thee;" or, as the Revised Version says, "a garment mingled of two kinds of stuff." Levit. xix. 19.

In Deut. xxii. 5, we read: "The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment; for all that do so are abomination to the Lord." Also in Deut. xxii. 9-11: "Thou shalt not sow thy vineyard with divers seeds; lest the fruit of the seeds which thou hast sown, and the fruit of the vineyard, be defiled. Thou shalt not plow with an ox and an ass together. Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and linen together."

These can hardly be mere arbitrary rules. They are divine statutes enjoined in wisdom. In two cases reasons are assigned—"abomination" in one case and "defilement" of fruits in another case. The crossing of bounds set by nature is "confusion," Levit. xviii. 23.

By comparing these several statutes we see that adulteration is the thing prohibited and the line is sharply drawn so as to rule out every appearance of it. Shams, imitations and adulterations seem to contravene and confuse differentiating lines which date back to creation. We need hardly show the necessary relations of shams to personal and social dishonesty. Modern civilization has a long road to travel before it gets back to the simple honesty of these ethical statutes. A material civilization which ignores these ethical codes must, sooner or later, become a godless civilization.

We have by no means exhausted all the details of the social code and its ethical features. It is necessary, however, to enter this caveat. We do not know how far these social statutes, as such, were a part of their criminal code to be enforced by the civil magistrate. Penalties are not always attached by the divine lawgiver. They signify his will and pleasure. Human laws and statutes are a dead letter unless enforced by penal sanction, defined and adjusted to their neglect or violation. But God left and still leaves a large part of moral, ethical and social statutes to be enforced in his providential government, and rewarded or punished at the final judgment. The Hebrew commonwealth was no great censor morum to regulate all the details of every day life, as so many suppose.

4. We might also construct a civil code. This would embrace causes to be tried before the civil magistrate in order to determine disputed claims and rights which do constantly arise among men. This would include collection of debts, divisions of inheritances, settling of disputes, divorce proceedings and such like. Such civil proceedings, both in law and equity are substantially the same in all good government. We find nothing exceptional or calling for special mention in the Hebrew civil code.

5. We might also construct a commercial code. Its several features call for a mere notice.

1. Just weights and measures were required and

regulated by law. Gold and silver passed by weight. Wine, oil and grain were exchanged by measure and other things in the same way, each according to its own denomination. Levit. xix. 36: "Just weights shall ye have; Deut. xxv. 13-15: "Thou shalt have a perfect and a just weight;" "Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights." Prov. xx. 10: "Divers weights and measures are an abomination unto the Lord."

It has been argued that the original standard inch for weights and measures was of divine origin and has been so providentially guarded, as it has been handed down the ages, that the English standard inch differs by less than a thousandth part from the "earth's commensurated unit inch" as found in the Great Pyramid, and on which the physical universe is constructed. This seems to fit Prov. xvi. 11: "All the weights of the bag are his work." It is also argued that the "Shekel of the Sanctuary" and other standards were kept at the Sanctuary just as they are kept in the Tower of London to-day. Absolute honesty is at the basis of a commercial code.

2. Usury in the Scriptures and in the older English means interest paid for the use of money. It has always been customary to pay interest for the use of money in commercial and speculative transactions where capital is needed for successful enterprises.

Usury was forbidden in case of a loan to an unfortunate brother (one of thy people") "that is poor by thee," or " is waxen poor, or fallen in decay;" "Thou shalt relieve him, yea, though he be a stranger (foreigner) or a sojourner, that he may live with thee." The line is sharply drawn at the poor and the unfortunate of any nationality who needed to borrow from necessity. But the lender is required to take the risk of the repayment of the principal if the borrower prove unable to repay it. On the other hand, there is no prohibition to charge interest to the prosperous borrower for commercial and speculative purposes, whether he be a Hebrew or a foreigner. Foreigners with them had the carrying trade, by land and by sea, and could use loans to advantage. "Thou mayest lend on usury to a stranger." Compare Ex. xxii. 25, 26; Levit. xxv. 35-37; Deut. xxiii. 20; Nehemiah v. 5-7; Deut. xv. 7-11.

It is easy to see that small farmers, artisans and tradesmen would usually have no occasion to borrow. Prosperous peasant populous have their little hoards with which they often help one another. But when disasters come, war, pestilence, drought, or famine, then the hoards must be turned loose without usury and without hope of return oftimes. Generosity in lending and in collecting also was the key note of this Hebrew legislation.

3. Creditor's rights. Such generosity as is above indicated would surely be abused in such a way as to dry up the fountains of kindness and helpfulness if the creditor had no rights by which he could protect himself against imposition. The creditor had the benefit of stringent laws for the collection of his loan without interest, even to selling the debtor and requiring him to work out his debt until the recurrence of the Sabbatical or Seventh year, which was the year of release of all debts, and also of Hebrew slaves within limits.

We find here, as in other places in these institutions, all proper checks and balances necessary to good government and to guarantee the true interests of all parties. The working of these laws secured a unique adjustment of justice and generosity.

CHAPTER XVI.

CODES CONTINUED.

VI. We come now to consider the criminal code, more properly called the Penal code. It is here that modern rationalistic critics get in their most plausible charges of cruelty and semi-barbarism. We may consider several of their penal statutes.

1. Capital punishment for murder. This would seem to be based on the primal instincts of the race. Cain said: "Every one that findeth me shall slay me," Gen. iv. 14. It was enjoined in the covenant with Noah for the race. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," Gen. ix. 5, 6. Even vicious and murderous beasts are to be put to death.

There are two kinds of punishment, condign or absolutely penal, and remedial or disciplinary. Condign punishments satisfy the demands of outraged justice and are a warning to others. Remedial and disciplinary punishments are equally based on the demands of justice and are equally intended to deter others from crime, with the super-added purpose of reclaiming and curing the offender. But in all punishments by the state the predominant idea is this: "The sword is a terror to evildoers." The ruler "is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." Rom. iii. 4.

Punishments in the family are righteous but disciplinary. So also in God's providential dealings with his people. Heb. xii. 3-11. We need not quote.

We must not forget, however, that outside of his children he says: "Vengeance is mine and I will repay."

The critic who arraigns retributive justice and condign punishment, and denies them to the civil magistrate, finds it easy to deny them to God also. He so manipulates his doctrine of the "Fatherhood of God" as to rule out the "wrath and curse of God both in this life and that which is to come." It is not our purpose to vindicate the righteousness of God's law, but only to show the exact attitude of those who reject it.

2. Capital punishment for rape and adultery. Peoples of all ages and of all grades of civilization have protected their women with the death penalty against the rapist. Lynch law to-day executes the sentence with terrific swiftness. Laws against adultery have not been so uniform. But from the days of Lamech, who slew the invader of his home, and made proclamation of his wrath and vengeance, on down the ages even to our day, the man who invades the home, does so at the risk of his life, no matter what the form of the law on the statute book. We have no apology to offer for Mosaic legislation on this matter.

Other forms of lewdness which need not be named were visited with the death penalty. This does not argue a low estimate of human life, but rather, the high estimate set on sexual purity. We find in Rom. i. 20-32, the picture of paganism with all its enormities unrestrained.

3. Capital punishment for a son who cursed or smote his father or his mother, or was stubborn and rebellious, "a drunkard and a glutton." Deut. xxi. 18-21: Ex. xxi. 15-17. "Whoso curseth his father or his mother, his lamp shall be put out in blackest darkness,"

Prov. xx. 20. R. V. This quotation from Proverbs utters a great truth which agrees well with this provision of the criminal code.

4. The same punishment was meted out to the man stealer and the kidnapper. Ex. xxi. 16. While this accords somewhat with modern legislation, which makes the slave trade piracy and the penalty death, we must not confound it with the institution of slavery, as we shall see later on.

5. In our discussion of the Theocracy we had occasion to note the death penalty for idolatry and false prophesy and other things and the theocratic reasons therefor. These were no part of the ordinary penal code and need not be rediscussed here.

6. The law of stripes. The punishment of the scourge or whip was very common among the Jews. Gen. xxv. 1-3: "They (the Judges) shall justify the righteous and condemn the wicked. And it shall be if the wicked man be worthy to be beaten, that the judge shall cause him to lie down, and to be beaten before his face, according to his fault, by a certain number. Forty stripes he may give him and not exceed; lest if he should exceed and beat him above these with many stripes, then thy brother should seem vile unto thee." The blows were given on the naked skin with a lash or whip of cords or strips of leather, and sometimes with rods or with sprouts and switches taken from trees.

This form of punishment was also used in the family as to-day and was highly commended by Solomon as we see from Prov. xxii. 15; xix. 18. This punishment was remedial and disciplinary both in the family and in the state.

The rabbis tell us that stripes were applied in a large class of offences for which the punishment was not specially prescribed in the law. Slaves were usually punished with stripes for all offences that were not capital.

There is a modern sentimental humanitarianism that denounces punishment by stripes as cruel, barbaric and brutal. Most civilized nations have eliminated stripes from their criminal code. In its place they have substituted fine and imprisonment. The fine they make punitive, and the prison, penitential, hence the name penitentiary. They likewise banish the rod from the family and the school as brutalizing, and they substitute in its place moral suasion, and punish the child by enjoining certain petty tasks and little irksome duties, or by withholding for a little season, certain pleasurable and wholesome enjoyments of childhood.

Imprisonment was no part of the Hebrew penal code. Though they were familiar with it in Egypt, it was deliberately rejected in their code. Stripes in moderation were given as a wholesome corrective, and the culprit was returned to his family to make an honest living for himself and them, in the face of a wholesome moral sentiment around him. Surely we hardly need argue the futility of the penitentiary system in comparison with this.

But, argues the objector, stripes destroy self respect and brutalize the culprit. 'Tis the crime and not the punishment that degrades and brutalizes. According to Moses excessive punishment would brutalize. The forty stripes was the limit; "But if he should exceed, and beat him above these with many stripes, then thy brother should seem to thee vile." Note the term "brother" in this connection. Excess were brutality and a brother would be brutalized.

It is of interest to note how the family and the state coincided in their reformatory measures, each directed by divine wisdom. And, what is more, reformatory discipline builds up character and restores self respect.

The rabbis tell us further that this penalty was not ignominious among the Jews, and that none were exempt, from the lowest to the highest. The truth of this has been questioned. Be it so. Can we conceive anything more ignominious than the titles "Jail-bird" and "convict from the pen," which shut the gate of hope in the face of the convicted evil doer to-day.

It is difficult to abstain from defending these institutions from the aspersions of self-appointed, hostile critics. God-given laws need no apology. We need only to be sure they are rightly understood.

7. The punishment of theft was unique—restoration four fold and five fold if the thief has parted with the stolen goods, but only double if found in his hand. Ex. xxii. 1, 4. If the thief repent and confess his fault he should add one-fifth in making restitution.

The idea of restitution runs through all legislation touching fraud, trespass, personal injuries, carelessness, breach of trust and such like; and if the offender had nothing with which to make restitution, he was sold and made to work it out. Modern legislation punishes the crime, but gives scant attention to "making good" between man and man. Which is the more merciful code, the ancient or the modern? The doctrine of punitive damages finds scant encouragement in Mosaic legislation, but it is the rich feeding ground of unscrupulous sharks and shysters and their debauched clients to-day.

8. The Lex talionis. "Thou shalt give life for life,

eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe," Ex. xxi. 23-25. This was the law for the judge to guide him in meting out the punishment to the offence, and that in a retributive way.

But the critic objects to the "barbarity" of corporal punishment in any form. He forgets that the shortest road to the soul (the real person) is through the body. Men imagine that they can bear any form of punishment provided that their precious bodies escape. This law was given by him who said, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Matt. x. 28. If the body shall not escape in future retribution, why must it escape in this life? But, says the critic, did not Christ set aside this barbarous code in the sermon on the mount? By no means. He did set aside the doctrine and practice of private revenges as taught by the Pharisees, but he nowhere interfered with or even criticised the due processes of law as set up by himself at Mt. Sinai, and as administered by himself as Theocratic King and supreme judge for fifteen hundred years. It is charitable to say that critics often draw their inspiration from a rationalistic ignorance rather than from a conscious hostility to the truth.

9. The martial code. These discussions would not be complete without making mention of the laws of war.

Much has been said and written in these days about war and its evils. Some go to the extreme and argue that all war is sinful. Just as the contact of nations multiplies, clashing interests and the causes of war are multiplied, international law and the mutual rights of nations are more and more defined. Courts of arbitration become more and more numerous and the equities are more and more recognized between nations. The time is coming when men "shall learn war no more, and they shall not hurt nor destroy in all God's holy mountain." The time is coming when "they shall beat their swords into plow shares and their spears into pruning hooks;" when the arts of peace shall supersede the arts of war.

This, however, does not make all wars unrighteous, nor an unmitigated evil. It is evident from history that oftimes the most precious principles and the most valuable human rights have been saved and vindicated by the arbitriment of the sword. It is, however, foreign to our purpose to make an exact definition of righteous and unrighteous wars, but to trace the status of war in Mosaic institutions.

1. The Lord, Jehovah, was the head and King of the Hebrew commonwealth and was Commander-in chief of the armies. He covenanted to fight their battles for them against all their enemies so long as they kept his covenant and walked in his commandments.

2. He directed strategic movements in battles, as in the seige and capture of Ai; and again, when Gideon with his three hundred men surprised and routed the hosts of the Midianites. He often gained the victory by the superior generalship of himself and his lieutenants.

3. Sometimes he interposed with his strong right arm with miraculous power. The walls of Jericho fell down at his bidding. Storm and hail stones and fire and a greatly lengthened day contributed to Joshua's victory over the Southern league. "The stars in their courses fought against Sesera." He swept through

the hosts of Sennacherib by night and the morning revealed one hundred and seventy five thousand dead corpses.

4. He ordered aggressive wars for good and sufficient reasons. We cite Moses' wars against the Midianites to punish their complicity with Balaam in the seduction of Israel; also Joshua's wars to dispossess the seven condemned nations and win for Israel the land promised to Abraham and his seed; so also, the wars against the Amalekites under Saul and David. These aggressive wars were commanded by prophet or oracle; and failure to carry out his commands in full were duly punished. No man dare call these wars unrighteous.

5. He discouraged aggressive wars under ordinary circumstances, and except as he ordered them. Nearly all their wars were defensive wars and would be pronounced righteous. For these they depended on volunteers without standing armies. Horsemen and war chariots were forbidden for they were needed only for aggressive wars and as a part of a permanent military organization.

Twice the entire military force was mobilized by a military census in preparation for the conquest of Palestine; but, later on, David and his people attempted the same sort of census and met the severest rebuke and punishment.

6. In case of war the call went out for volunteers who carried their provisions with them. They returned home when the campaign was out. Spoils taken in war were the only pay they received for service and even they had to be, not only tithed, but divided equally with those who remained at home. This saved

the armies from being debauched and brutalized by war.

7. Ordinarily conquered peoples were put under tribute, and were not plundered; and they were allowed to retain their own rulers and their local self-government. There were two exceptions to this. One was the conquests East and West of the river under Moses and Joshua. In the seven years' war of conquest they were required to dispossess, drive out and exterminate the condemned nations because the "Cup of their iniquity was full." They were the appointed executioners of the divine wrath for all their abominations. The same God executed vengeance on Sodom and Gomorroh in another way. It was a righteous judgment in each case. Such warfare was not regular and normal war.

The other exception was in the case of cities which refused to surrender and make honorable terms of submission and peace, but held out to the bitter end. Such cities when taken by storm were to be given over to sack and carnage and to the horrors of successful war. The reason of this is not hard to see. It is really the law of war to this day.

8. There were certain exemptions from military service. The tribe of Levi were exempted, because they were the ministers of religion and also the educators of the nation. They often volunteered with others for martial service and were heroic in battle. When the volunteers came they were polled and the timid and the fearful were excused, and the newly married man, and the man who had built a home and had not occupied it, and also the man who had planted a vineyard and had not eaten the fruit of it.

On this presentation of their laws of war we can but admire the many provisions which mitigated its severity. They are every way worthy of their great captain, the Lord of Hosts.

We close this discussion of the codes by quoting again, "The law is holy and the commandment is holy, just and good."

CHAPTER XVII.

HOW FAR JEWISH INSTITUTIONS ARE BINDING OR IMITABLE.

We have already seen that the Hebrew commonwealth was a Theocracy, the leading features of which we have discussed in a previous chapter. This was the only Theocracy that has ever existed. The Lord proposed this form of civil government to the Hebrews and they agreed thereto, and set it up by unanimous vote. It could originate in no other way.

There have been numerous imitations in which a priesthood has dominated the civil government in the name and with the pretended authority of their God, and they have supported their claims with false prophets and spurious oracles. All other theocracies have been mischievous imitations and counterfeits. The most notable one in more modern times is Popery. For centuries it was a great civil power which dominated all Christendom. The Pope claimed to be the vice-gerent of heaven and demanded the loyal submission and obedience of all nations. For a long period none dared dispute his authority over church and state, except a remnant who were well-nigh ground to powder. Religious persecution was the logical fruit of this usurpation, and the Inquisition was its handmaid. Jesuitism was the twin sister.

Like every other usurpation, it has been bloodthirsty and cruel. In claiming to be the Theocratic head of the nations "He exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God shewing himself that he is God," 2 Thess. ii. 4. He has claimed to have supreme authority over the fortunes and destinies of men, as the vice-gerent of heaven. All sins were pronounced crimes at his supreme pleasure, to be punished at his will. This certainly is the divine prerogative and it was claimed as such.

It is not out of place here to distinguish between sin and crime. Sin is toward God. Sin ignores God's holy law in thought and desire or in violation and transgression. God has never given to civil government the right to punish sin as such. This is just as much a divine prerogative as the forgiveness of sin. Crime is a violation of civil law and thereby an injury to the state, and punishable by the state. The civil law may or may not, in itself, have moral quality, and the violation of it may or may not be a sin against God. We may not always be able to decide in a particular case when sin becomes crime and is punishable by the state, but the distinction is obvious.

A usurping theocracy makes its definition of sin. It determines what sins are crimes against its welfare, and weilds the sword in punishment. It affects to visit on the sinner the wrath and curse of God, both in this life and that which is to come, because it usurps God's seat.

But in the true and only theocracy of which Jehovah was the civil head, certain sins of necessity became crimes against the commonwealth. Some of these were so flagrant that they would utterly destroy it if they were not restrained and punished with the severest pains and penalties. False phrophecy, idolatry, witchcraft, sacrilege and some other things were punished with death without mercy, because, in their essence and in their outcome, they were high treason. Their success would have overthrown the commonwealth. This has been discussed in the chapter on the Theocracy.

We are now prepared to answer the question, How far are Jewish institutions and laws imitable? We must rule out everything which is essentially theocratic because no civil government to-day is a theocracy. It may not be easy to decide whether certain features are theocratic or not, but, in the main, the line of distinction is obvious.

Why was Sabbath breaking visited with the death penalty? The man that gathered sticks on the Sabbath was stoned by divine direction. Num. xv. 32-36. The law is emphatic in Ex. xxxi. 14, 15. This was not the law from the beginning, nor is it at the present day. But the Sabbath had a theocratic feature added to it at Mt. Sinai. "It is a sign between me and you throughout all your generations." "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever." Sabbath observance was the sign and seal of the theocratic covenant on the part of the people. Sabbath breaking thus became a crime as well as a sin—a crime that repudiated the theocratic covenant.

We may now ask, How comes it that the civil arm can punish a Sabbath breaker to-day? There were two institutions set up for the race at the beginning, the family and Sabbath. It is the function of the state to conserve, protect and foster them both. The state canot promote holiness in the family, nor punish the sin of Sabbath breaking, as such, but it can and ought to punish every effort to destroy these two primordial institutions. When the state passes laws to this end a violation of those laws becomes crime.

The same principle runs through the entire decalogue. God reserves to himself the punishment of sin as sin; and he has given to the civil magistrate the authority to restrain and punish evil doers.

The Levitical code of which mention has been made in a former chapter, was not discussed fully for reasons given. It might be called the Ecclesiastical code as well, including the ceremonial code. These several codes give us the rights, franchises and government of the church, and must not be confounded with civil codes, though the Lord was the head of both. Neither was allowed to dominate the other nor to use the other in its own interests. Much less could either enforce the codes of the other by pains and penalties.

The extreme punishment inflicted by ecclesiastical law was excommunication expressed by the phrase, "He shall be cut off from his people." This phrase sometimes signifies the death penalty. But this sense is to be gathered from context, as in Ex. xxxi. 14. Several times the Lord says, "I will cut him off from among his people," and "I will destroy," as in Levit. xx. 3, 5, 6. These refer to his righteous judgment upon capital offences, and heinous sins.

But in the administration of ecclesiastical and ceremonial law this phrase is used without any hint of capital crime or punishment by the civil arm. The punishment was exclusion from religious ordinances and sanctuary privileges so long as the offence continued. We may mention some of these offences: Neglect of circumcision, eating blood, eating fat of sacrifice, making an offering outside of the camp, eating the Passover when unclean, and vice versa; eating leavened bread in Passover week, failure to observe purifying rites, presumptuous sins unforgiven, and, in short, any neglect or violation of the ceremonial law. Consult Ex. xxx. 33, xii. 15, 19; Num. xv. 30; Levit. vii. 20, 21, 25, 26, 27; xvii. 4, 9, 14; xix. 8; Num. ix. 13, etc.

This is what we call church discipline and has been recognized in all ages, and is worthy of all imitation in order to secure and conserve doctrine and practice. The pains and penalties are all moral and belong in no sense to the civil arm to inflict. Here again we see the absurdity and the cruelty of religious persecution. We need not pause here to inquire how religious persecution grew up in joint civil and ecclesiastical courts in later times.

Failure to make the distinctions noted above in the several meanings of the words "cut off," and the assumption that they always mean the death penalty, has led to much scoffing; and many, true and loyal, have been greatly staggered in their faith in the supreme righteousness of Old Testament institutions. There is no problem so difficult that we cannot afford to wait for light, rather than impugn the "wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth" of God.

Thus far we have answered the question of this chapter negatively, by exclusion and by differentiation. We are now prepared to announce a few positive categories, which will need but little discussion or elucidation.

1. All of Moses' civil law is right both in principle and in its applications, for the legislator was divine. He made no concessions to pernicious customs. He made no compromises with evils, to be subsequently eliminated. He was no compromising politician that did the best he could under the circumstances. His perfect statesmanship cannot be challenged. The critic sets himself up to

be wiser than God, or else he is grossly ignorant of the institutions he condemns. Others again do belittle God's handiwork in the interests of a false philosophy which is easily exposed.

2. There is no objection to saying that these institutions were in the main older than Sinaitic legislation, and that they were adopted, modified, improved and adapted to changing conditions. The decalogue was not a new moral code. The family, the Sabbath, and moral obligation date back to the beginning. Sin and crime were sin and crime from the beginning. The deterioration of the race and the waters of the Flood lend us their testimony. Sound principles were the basis of all that was good before Sinai just as they have been since, and they originated with God. The doctrines of the ages were made permanent at Mt. Sinai. They were not only written out for permanent preservation, but they were embodied and embalmed in the institutions of a great and enduring people. These "oracles of God" were committed to them for preservation and transmission.

3. Divine and human legislation are in striking contrast. "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne; mercy and truth shall go before thy face." Ps. lxxxix. 14. His justice is tempered with mercy in infinite wisdom. Man's legislation is fallible like himself. His policies are often narrow, shortsighted and selfish, and even in positive hostility to God's holy law. His best codes are good only as they approximate the divine pattern.

4. The principles of civil jurisprudence are permanent and are embodied in all systems to a greater or less extent. Natural conscience and the sanctions of religion have helped to preserve and hand them down the ages.

The Jews and their Scriptures contributed largely to this result. In the Roman Empire the ambitious Roman citizen sought military conquest and martial glory, or else sought civic honors at home and abroad. But the Jew practiced in the law courts, taught the law schools, and codified the body of Roman civil law, not only for the empire, but for succeeding ages to the present day.

5. It would be easy to show that those nations to-day which cherish the Scriptures as of supreme authority have the best political institutions, and are the best governed, because they approximate most nearly to the God-given standard.

We may note further, all church government and all civil government ought to be organized on the same fundamental principles, on the same *jure divino* models. Those nations which have been dominated by the Papacy and the Greek church have also been the worst governed civilly. The Protestant Reformation was a gigantic struggle to secure civil and religious liberty according to the Scriptures, and it was successful in less than half of the Papal domain. The struggle has not yet begun in the domain of the Greek church. Let Russian intolerance testify.

6. Though fundamental principles are permanent and must not be ignored or violated, the details of their application may vary widely. Slavish imitation of details is not necessary in following the divine models, but may be harmful. Biblical details may be imitated, other things being equal, or they may be modified according to varying conditions. But in all cases it is easy to recognize an identity of bold outline wherever sound principles are maintained.

The great fault of many modern republics is slavish imitation with no true comprehension of fundamental principles, either in church or state. One cannot be reformed and conformed to sound principles without the other. Even in our own country the ardent prelatist and the independent in religion must, sooner or later, surrender the principles of representative free government in the state. Their logical outcome is oligarchy on the one hand or a licentious democracy on the other. Is it too much to say that these two are already in deadly conflict?

7. Their merely positive institutions and laws are not necessarily binding because they embody no principle. We make a distinction between moral and positive laws. Moral laws originate in moral distinctions, and carry with them a sense of moral obligation. Such laws are binding from the nature of the case. Positive laws are enacted to secure something that seems desirable to the lawgiver, but they are based on reasons other than moral.

Administrative rules in government are of this nature and might vary widely with no breach of morals. Such laws issued by competent authority must be obeyed, of course, for reasons other than moral. Many things in every code are of this character. Even in divine law we say that God commands some things because they are right, and some things are right because God commands them. Some institutions also are based on necessary moral distinctions and others are accepted or rejected at pleasure and there is no special merit or moral turpitude in either case.

There is in social and civil life a wide range of things to be chosen or rejected, and the man is none the better or none the worse. Even the family is a positive institution. The law of liberty prevails in every case whether to marry or not, and when, where, and to whom, and also as to a second marriage and so on. Paul remained unmarried under this law of liberty and counted himself no better or no worse than Peter who had a wife. There is no such law of liberty in the decalogue nor in any law or institution based upon it.

Hence we say that positive institutions may or may not be imitated, other things being equal. They involve no moral question. Paul says, if we eat meat we are no better, and if we eat it not we are no worse. 1 Cor. viii. 8. They are entirely innocent in themselves. There are many civil and social institutions of this character in all governments.

We shall consider and discuss the institution of slavery, in the next chapter, as belonging to this class of positive institutions. In the face of all this how can a fugitive slave law be characterized as the "sum of all iniquities?"

By comparing Deut. xxiii. 15, 16 and 1 Kings ii. 39, 40, the fugitive slave law of the Jews seems to have been this; fugitive slaves were recoverable anywhere within their civil jurisdiction; but fugitives from other nations were not to be arrested and returned to their masters, but allowed to live among them wherever they chose. The fugitive slave law of the United States was modeled on this.

The consideration of the famous passage in 1 Tim. vi. 1-6, is reserved for the next chapter.

CHAPTER XVIII.

SLAVERY—ITS BIBLE STATUS.

The word "slave" occurs twice in the English Scriptures, once in Jer. ii. 14—"Is Israel a servant? Is he a home born slave?" It is inserted here by the translators in both versions. The distinction is drawn here between the acquired slave and the born slave. The plural, "slaves," is found in Rev. xviii. 13. But the word in the Greek means "bodies." "The bodies and souls of men" are enumerated as part of the merchandise of "Babylon, the Great," the "Mother of Harlots."

But such terms as these are found throughout the Scriptures, to-wit, bondmen, bondwomen, manservants, maidservants, bondservant, bondmaid, etc. The word "servant" is used numerously to signify a slave as opposed to a hireling. There is no need to cite passages to prove this usage, nor to sustain it by an appeal to the Greek and Hebrew. No one disputes it. It is also true that the word servant is also used in other and modified senses—especially in courteous humility as, "Thy servant Jacob' and such like. However, we are not here concerned with other varied uses of the term servant.

Slavery was a social rather than a civil institution, and the slave was a member of the master's family. The master's ownership of the slave was twofold. He was entitled to the labor of the slave; and he was entitled to such control over the persons and movements of the slave as might be necessary in order to secure his labor. The ownership went no further than these two things.

On the other hand the master rendered to his slave, in return for his labor, food and raiment, and support for his family, young, old, or infirm. He was also bound for the same righteous government of all his household, as we shall see.

There are two anti-slavery views which differ from each other. One has opposed slavery as undesirable for economic reasons only, especially in our day. They make no criticism of Mosaic institutions and raise no moral issues. On the other hand many proslavery men among us justified slavery on purely economic grounds, and resented the introduction of moral issues. Both these have regarded slavery as a positive institution having in itself no moral question. They held that a man might or might not have slaves in his family as seemed to him wise, and he was none the better or none the worse therefor.

The other anti-slavery view we call abolitionism. It declares slavery to be sinful in itself. It makes the relation sinful. The fanatic has denounced it as the sum of all iniquities, to be destroyed at all hazards. We shall notice later its attitude toward the Scriptures in this matter.

It is not our purpose to discuss the economic aspects of slavery except in an incidental way. But we wish to discover its status in the Scriptures from early times to the close of the canon, and to show that it was not an unrighteous institution, and also to discover the relation of the state to it as a social institution.

Slavery has existed in all ages and among all nations in varied forms and degrees from actual personal ownership to clientelage, serfdom, a permanent peasantry and permanent dependants in aristocratic establishments. National and civil stability have been based in large measure upon some of these. It remains to be tested whether all such things can be permanently abolished in the interest of an absolute democracy, especially where racial problems emerge.

We are now prepared to consider the Bible status of slavery.

1. Hebrew slavery antedates the theocracy and Mosaic institutions, even to the time of Abraham. Gen. xiv. 14, "When Abraham heard that his brother (Lot) was taken captive, he armed his trained servants, born in his own house, three hundred and eighteen, and pursued after them unto Dan." The word servant was introduced by the translators. We cannot doubt that these were slaves for we find in Gen. xvii. 12 these words, "He that is born in the house or bought with money." This is elucidated by the quotation already made from Jer- ii. 14.

Starting with the basis of three hundred and eighteen slaves trained for war, it is estimated that Abraham owned one or two thousand slaves, old and young, male and female. His great wealth of flocks and herds, menservants and maidservants made this nomadic prince the peer of the people among whom he sojourned. Many of his slaves were "bought of the stranger (foreigner)." Gen. xvii. 12. Eliezer was from Damascus, and Hagar was an Egyptian.

His sons and heirs, Isaac and Jacob were prosperous on their own account. And when the sixty-six went down to Egypt they carried all their wealth of flocks and herds, menservants and maidservants, a large nucleus of a larger population, which justified the gift of the magnificent crownlands of Rameses or Goshen, the very best district of Egypt. It is easy to see that by steady manumission and assimilation the Hebrews were two million strong when they emerged from Egypt at the end of two hundred and fifteen years.

2. Slaveholding was recognized in the Abrahamic covenant and sanctified by the sign and seal of circumcision. Abraham was circumcised at ninety-nine years old and Ishmael at thirteen years old; and "All the men of his house, born in his house, and bought with money of the stranger, were circumcised with him," and every male child thereafter.

This covenant and its seal were not civil, but religious, according to Paul in Rom. iv. 11. "He received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." This is argued fully throughout the fourth chapter of Romans. This implies the responsibility of the master for the religious welfare of the slave as well as his child; and also the equality of master, child and slave in the spiritual kingdom and in the household of faith.

This Abrahamic covenant was no temporary device, nor were the parties to it ever limited to the natural seed of Abraham. Paul argues its perpetuity in the fourth chapter of Galatians, concluding with verse 29, "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." We find no change in its scope and details except Baptism into Christ in place of circumcision, verse 27.

Who knows whether the curse and blight which has fallen on slavery in Christendom may not have come because God's people failed to recognize the place of the slave in this covenant and the responsibility of the master for the spiritual welfare of his slave just as for the other members of his household? Abraham's faithfulness in this matter was commended and made the ground of most intimate relations with God. Gen. xviii. 17-19. How then may we denounce slavery as a sinful relation?

3. The master's authority and responsibility are recognized and emphasized in the fourth commandment, exactly as for other members of his family. His property rights in his manservant and in his maidservant are protected amply in the tenth commandment. Reject the righteous ownership of slaves and you must by the same jugglery reject all rights of property.

The Decalogue is a covenant, permanent and universal, and of perpetual binding force. No part of it can ever be superseded and no principle found in it can ever be set aside, repealed or modified. The two tables were deposited in the ark of the covenant beneath the mercy seat. They shall endure as long as his eternal throne. How then shall the provisions of the fourth and tenth commandments be set aside?

4. Moses' law discouraged the permanent enslavement of Hebrews. A man might be sold for debt, or to make restitution, or to pay fines in civil cases, and his family might be sold with him, but they all went out free when the seventh year came. And if a man married a slave in his master's family and preferred to remain in service with his family, his ears were bored and he was adjudged a permanent slave by the magistrate. In the case of a daughter sold to be a maidservant she could not go out free unless she was betrothed to her master or his son and the contract was not fulfilled, at least to the extent of such support as was given to daughters. All of which we learn from Ex. xxi. 1-11, and Levit. xxv. 39-43.

But they were encouraged to buy such slaves as they desired from foreigners which they might keep for a permanent possession and for an inheritance to their children. Levit. xxv. 44-46.

There was still another case. A man might sell himself to a prosperous stranger living in the land, himself and family. But the law allowed him the right of redemption, either by himself or near kinsman. If not redeemed they went out free at the year of Jubilee. Levit. xxv. 47-55. All these cases are cited to show that slavery was legalized by divine law, and the slave owner was guilty of no breach of moral law.

5. Moses' law recognized, defined, limited and defended the rights and duties of both masters and slaves with great minuteness. Ex. xxi. 20, 21, 26, 27, 32. We need not quote details except to say that while the master might punish his slave he was not allowed to abuse him, and the law protected life and limb, and gave him ample compensation for cruelty by giving him his freedom.

6. Captives taken in war were divided as spoil by divine direction in at least one case, and in tithing the spoil the Lord's portion was duly set apart. God commanded Moses to make war on the Midianites to punish them for their connection with the seduction of Israel in the plains of Moab—a war of extermination, except to save alive for themselves all the female children. We have an elaborate inventory of all the spoil of all sorts, and its distribution, one half to the men who went to battle and one half to the congregation. Of the thirty-two thousand persons, "women, children," one-tenth (3,200) were given to the Levites. One tenth of these (320) were given to the priests; "of which the Lord's tribute was thirty and two persons." The Lord received

one thousandth part of all the other spoil also, according to the usual law of tithing. This was all done by Moses under divine direction. All of which we find in Num. xxxi. 1-51. It is remarkable that a second tithe was distributed, in the same way, "to the Levites that had charge of the tabernacle of the Lord." The persons were evidently held for service about the tabernacle. There was much to be done about the tabernacle and its curtains and the vestments of the priests, etc., that could be better done by women.

Will any scoff at this divine ownership? Let them also scoff at this, "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein;" or at this, "Ye are not your own, ye are bought with a price"—a double ownership, by creation and redemption.

7. Family slavery was in its origin a merciful system. Cicero says, *"Servus quia servatus."* Captives taken in war were spared from slaughter and lodged in families where they were protected from national antagonisms, first by the master's interest, and then by his affection. In course of time this affection ended in manumission and then in final assimilation and absorption. Even in pagan Rome the freed-men became a great power in the empire because manumission was more rapid than absorption. In Hebrew society manumission went on rapidly by intermarriage and by proselytism to a common religious faith. The problem has been much more difficult where racial instincts and antagonisms have been strong.

8. Abolitionism, which holds that slavery is a sin *per se*, admits the facts we have cited, but seeks to parry their force by saying that Moses did the best he could under the circumstances by way of compromise with evils strongly intrenched. The obvious reply is that God was

no compromising politician. He made no compromise with idolatry nor any prevalent sin. Hab. i. 13, cf. Acts xvii. 30. His institutions and codes are absolutely and eternally right.

The abolitionist in reply cites Goelism, divorce, and polygamy as three parallel cases of compromise with evil and sin. We have discussed these three so-called blemishes in Mosaic institutions and found naught to censure. We need not repeat it here; and slavery, if a blemish, stands alone.

It is not so customary to denounce the New Testament as full of blemishes and imperfections. Let us see if it has any word about slavery. We need not expect to find any new legislation or any new teaching on moral questions in the New Testament, either from Christ or his apostles.

9. The New Testament recognizes, enjoins and enforces the rights and duties of masters and slaves as distinctly as the Old Testament. There is, however, no legislation on the subject, but these duties are argued and taught as matters of moral Christian obligation, just as all other duties. There is no hint that the relation of master and slave is any more sinful than the relation of husband and wife, parent and child, ruler and people. The mutual duties of all are argued in the same way, and laid on the Christian conscience in the same way. They are all to be performed for Christ's sake. Nothing is put on the low ground of compromise, or tolerance, or expediency, but on this high and holy appeal, "as unto the Lord."

The reciprocal duties in all these varied relations are grouped in Colossians, Ephesians, Titus, and First Peter. And the slavery question is discussed separately in First

Timothy, as if there were some great abolition heresy to be combated in Paul's day.

10. These teachings concerning slavery cannot be explained away. If the language of Paul and Peter had originated with some modern pro-slavery man, the author would have been denounced as a pro-slavery fanatic. And, as it is, Paul and Peter are excused for their utterances because, forsooth, they were controlled by the low moral standards of their day; but a higher and a better code has been evolved out of the Christian consciousness in these last days. It is argued that Christ gave the golden rule as a germ truth, planted in Christian soil, and destined to supersede the crudities of his day. However, we shall not follow the critics into the mazes into which this would lead us for we are only discovering the Bible status of slavery, assuming the inspiration of the Scriptures, and guarding somewhat against misconceptions and misinterpretations.

11. We may quote some of the words of Paul and Peter. Col. iii. 22-25, "Servants (*douloi,* slaves), obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eyeservice as men-pleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God, etc." Eph. vi. 5-9, "Servants, be obedient, etc.; as unto Christ, etc.; as servants of Christ, etc.; with goodwill doing service, as unto the Lord and not unto men." Titus ii. 9, 10, "Exhort servants to be obedient, etc., not answering again; not purloining, but shewing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things." 1 Pet. ii. 18-21, "Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward, etc."

It is not out of place to note here that bondservice is the typical good service of the Bible, while the "hireling" (*misthotes,* the hired servant) is the synonym for unfaithfulness, neglect and treachery. Compare Rom. vi. 16-22, and Jno. x. 12, 13.

12. Paul lived up to these teachings at the sacrifice of his own comfort and pecuniary interests. The Epistle to Philemon tells the story. Onesimus, a slave, had run away from his master, Philemon, and gone to another city, supposed to be Rome. There he met Paul and embraced the Gospel and devoted himself to Paul as to another master; and Paul would have been glad to retain him to minister unto him. But he sent him back to his master as a matter of right, and sent the letter by him.

He asked Philemon to forgive him for his wrong doing and treat him kindly as a brother in Christ. He promised to pay him for any wrong done or any debt due. He was persuaded that Philemon would do even more than he asked because of their relations of father and son in the Gospel.

CHAPTER XIX.

ABOLITIONISM—ITS TENDENCIES AND AFFILIATIONS.

We have seen that slavery has always been a social institution limited to the family. Also it is a positive institution involving no question of morals. This or any other human institution may be abused in a sinful way, and will be more or less abused as long as man is a sinner. We must make a sharp distinction between sin in a given relation and a sinful relation. National slavery, so-called, has usually been of the nature of drafting, impressment, or tribute service, and has included much of army and navy service in the past. But this can hardly be classed as a part of the institution of slavery. The bondage in Egypt and the levies made by Solomon, partly upon his own people and more largely upon the condemned nations, were cases in point. But these were sporadic, local and temporary according to national exigencies or the caprice of rulers. We are discussing slavery as a Mosaic social institution.

The institution of slavery grew into disfavor in the Roman Empire for cause, and the kingdoms that grew out of the Empire, in Europe, at least, developed their laboring populations into serfs, peasants, retainers, tenants, clansmen, etc.—a modified ownership.

Slavery proper was revived after the discovery of America. The English, Spanish, Portugese and others needed labor for their colonies in the New World. African slaves seemed to be the easiest, if not the only solution, and the African slave trade grew to enormous proportions. The trade itself and the American plantations yielded enormous revenues. Slavery was firmly established in the West Indies, South America, Mexico and the North American colonies. The horrors of the African slave trade grew out of these nations.

England gained her naval and commercial supremacy from this trade, besides accumulating capital which gave her prominence in manufactures, aided, however, by other conspiring causes. New England gained her commercial and manufacturing supremacy from the same source.

A strong anti-slavery sentiment, entirely economic, grew up in the Southern colonies. But they were unable to stop the importation of African slaves because of the influence of New England which refused to enter the Federal Union if the slave trade were prohibited. Finally a compromise was effected, limiting it to twenty years longer—1808.

Slavery proved unproductive in New England and other Northern states and gradual emancipation became the rule, while most of their slaves were sold into the Southern states; and even there the institution was not profitable for the lack of some great staple and also for lack of transportation. The price of slaves ruled low for these reasons and also because of the glut in the market from causes already mentioned. The economic questions only were considered seriously in those days and several of the Southern states were nearly ready for emancipation.

After the Napoleonic wars there sprang up in Great Britain a powerful anti-slavery sentiment which soon issued in the abolition of slavery in the British colonies. This was commonly called Exeter Hall abolition. Its arguments were mainly economic, and but slightly humanitarian, and in no sense anti-scriptural. The argument was simple and taking. "It is not right that free born Englishmen are subject to the competition of compulsory savage labor. Abolish slavery and the price of labor will rise." The result was that the price of labor rose throughout the English speaking world. Southern slaveholders grew suddenly rich, for the price of slaves rose five-fold.

This did not satisfy Exeter Hall abolitionists and they transferred the base of operations to Faneuil Hall, Boston. American slavery was attacked from the same point of view and with the same argument. The original abolitionists such as Gerritt Smith, William H. Seward, John P. Morton, Thad. Stevens and Hilton Helper went no further than Exeter Hall abolition. "It is not right for freeborn American citizens to be subjected to the competition of compulsory savage labor." Abolish slavery and negro slavery will disappear as a rival, just as it had done in the British colonies. But the American people were so prosperous that they did not feel the effect of the competition and could not be aroused.

Political rivalries, however, soon developed a sentimental and humanitarian abolitionism, which soon ripened into a party of "Great Moral Ideas." The pulpit was added to the hustings as the arena for its propagandism. Dr. Cheever, famous in his day, in his third political sermon, preached all slaveholders to hell as manstealers. Dr. Albert Barnes, the theologian and commentator, said, Show me that the Bible sanctions slavery and the Bible is no Bible to me. Thousands in the pulpit and out of it championed this view. Slavery became a sin *per se.* The slaveholder was denounced as a sinner and a criminal without rights. The constitution that protected the rights of the master was openly denounced as a "covenant with the devil and a league with hell."

Many satisfied their orthodoxy by explaining away the Bible teachings as all errorists usually do. Others attacked and rejected the Scriptures because of their obvious teaching. Still others held on to the Scriptures, but discovered this and other blemishes in them which they accounted for and excused in various ways. Modern abolition, as a forerunner, prepared an easy road for German "advanced scholarship" in the American churches. The principles of interpretation by which the Scriptures were judged in the abolition crusade make it easy for "modern progressive thought" to reject all truth.

It is modern, or rather, recent abolitionism that we have sought to bring to the test of the Scriptures in our study of Mosaic institutions.

Abolition was a burning question in Paul's day in the Roman Empire. The enormous accumulation of lands in the hands of a few was cultivated by unnumbered slaves of all nationalities. From this originated the great agrarian struggles which culminated in the unparalleled servile wars which put in jeopardy the entire civil government. The landholding and slaveholding oligarchy were heartily hated by the masses of the people. The natural result of all this was wholesale manumission by which the aristocracy surrounded themselves with a clientelage of freedmen and thereby secured a little longer lease of power.

It was not strange that abolitionism penetrated the church and gave serious trouble. Have we evidence of this? We find it in 1 Tim. vi. 1-6. We need to quote the entire passage. "Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them for they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise and consent not to wholesome words even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof come envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputing of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness. From such withdraw thyself. But godliness with contentment is great gain."

It is evident that Paul is discussing slavery and abolition agitators. A careful analysis of the passage gives us the following propositions:

1. It is the duty of the slave to count his master worthy of all honor. We have seen that Paul and Peter teach this in a number of places.

2. Failure so to do gives occasion to blaspheme the name of God and his doctrine or teaching.

3. In the case of believing masters and slaves the bond is cemented and sanctified by a common brotherhood in Christ.

4. Timothy is commanded to teach and exhort these things. Why? Evidently because some taught otherwise to the damage of the doctrine of God.

5. Paul calls these doctrines wholesome words, and he puts them into the mouth of the Lord Jesus Christ, contrary to the general opinion that Christ had nothing to say about slavery.

6. He teaches that these words are according to godliness. Then of course a contrary doctrine and practice can lay no claim to godliness.

7. There were agitators who taught otherwise. These were the abolitionists of that day who rejected the teaching of Christ just as they do to-day.

8. They were proud, ignorant, contentious, corrupt, destitute of the truth. They fomented envy, strife, railings and evil surmisings. Their pretended scholarship doted about questions and strifes of words, and ended in perverse disputings. What a description. Language is exhausted. We have had their counterpart in these last days.

9. Their inspiration was covetousness. They supposed that gain was godliness. Was this a sentimental abolitionism? Was it humanitarism? Was it based on the golden rule? Was it born of a newly acquired faith in Christ? Was it a great moral impulse to right the wrongs of the opperssed? Was it a patriotic impulse toward improving economic conditions? Not a bit of it. Such men were incapable of any such sentiments and impulses. Their inspiration was covetousness—gain and not godliness—a pernicious selfishness that fattened on the overthrow of social institutions and the untold disasters to master and slave.

10. No wonder Paul said, "From such withdraw thyself." Away with that mawkish charity which extends the right hand of fellowship to such as pervert and destroy the truth, who reject the source of all true doctrine, and dethrone the Scriptures, and reject the divine holiness in his God-given institutions. "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness," "What concord hath Christ and belial?" "Come out and be separate, saith the Lord." 1 Cor. vi. 14-18.

11. The true doctrine for this and other righteous social institutions is this, "Godliness with contentment is great gain."

We shall not here sum up the evidence to prove that the humanitarianism of modern abolition proved itself to be deceitful, fanatical, skeptical, selfish, cruel and self-contradictory, a reproduction of the abolitionism of Paul's day.

We would classify it as one mode of a pantheistic rationalism which identifies humanity and divinity and exalts human reason to the rank and dignity of inspiration, or rather, it brings all truth, human and divine, to the test of individual reason. Its watchword is "Liberty and Equality." It rejects the authority of man over his fellow man in the name of this liberty. Its modern triumphs have been notable and progressive.

1. It first struck down authority in the state. Its proclamation was *"vox populi, vox Dei."* "The voice of the people is the voice of God." The ruler has become the servant of the people instead of a ruler—an office holder, an employee serving for wages, an agent to do the people's will. Old-fashioned representative republicanism disappears in the interest of a licentious democracy. Law loses its authority and the ruler his reverence. This philosophy bore its terrible fruits in the French revolution. Its tide was stayed for a season by these horrors. Its more recent progress has been under the forms of law and government and has well nigh made conquest of all republics.

2. This enemy of authority next struck family government in the authority of the master over the slave. This seemed to be the weakest point in family government. Stories of the cruelty of masters enlisted the sympathies of most excellent people and made it easier to accept the agitator's false philosophy.

The doctrine of an advanced Christian ethics, evolved out of the golden rule and the law of love, was very fascinating and gendered spiritual pride, than which nothing is more lacking in charity. Bible ethics became obsolete in the matter of slavery, and a "higher law" justified extravagance, fanaticism and deceit. The victory has been complete in Christendom. There have been many cruel fathers, many cruel rulers, many cruel masters; but these are nothing when compared to the enormities which have been perpetrated in the name of liberty, equality and a higher law.

The next move of this pantheistic rationalism is to strike down the headship of the man over the woman. The advocates of this false philosophy admit that the Scriptures thoughout teach this headship; or, at least, they recognize this headship as pervading all social constitutions and institutions found in them. But this is accounted for by the barbarism of all oriental peoples. It was not to be expected that any body of those times could rise above the vicious moral standards of that early day. This brings us again face to face with those who strike down the authority of Scripture in the interest of human conceits. So far this false philosophy is consistent.

4. It further strikes at all human rights, based on law, custom, birth or personal achievement. It is the prolific mother of Socialism, Anarchism, Nihilism, Commune, and Internationale, and also divers modifications of all these. In the name of liberty and equality they would disintegrate all institutions, social, civil and ecclesiastical. They would substitute in their place the cruel despotism of their own personal greed.

Thus extremes meet—anarchy and despotism, the opposite poles of the same great heresy. In our country both labor and capital in their mutual struggles base their pleas on inalienable personal rights and each throttles competition in the name of equality. The end is not yet.

5. Atheism, the sworn confederate of all these, dethrones a personal God, exalts reason as the universal standard of truth, if indeed there be any truth and righteousness; and it recognizes force as the universal agent. So, again, everything falls under the imperious despotism of fate. Extremes meet again. That which destroys legitimate and righteous authority sets up in its place a rayless and hopeless despositsm of selfish greed, cruel hate, universal distrust and despair.

No. The Scriptures are the Magna Charta of human rights and the bulwark of human liberty. We must bring every institution, every philosophy, every ethical system, every creed, every doctrine, every practice, to the test of th inspired word of God; or else we drift out into mid ocean and its raging storms without pilot, sail, chart or compass, drifting out and out into the blackness of darkness forever.

Date Due

N 14 '38			
N 28 '38			
Ja 3 '39			
~~OCT 2 '62~~			
~~FEB 27 '75~~			
~~OCT 15 1990~~			
~~NOV 15 1990~~			

BS620 .S53
Hebrew institutions : social and civil.
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00045 4886